





THE
PROTESTANT,

A SERIES OF ESSAYS

ON THE

1. PRINCIPAL POINTS OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

Church of Rome

AND

THE REFORMED.

VOL. I.

TENTH EDITION.

GLASGOW:
BLACKIE & SON, 38, QUEEN STREET;
5, SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND 21, WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXVII.

GEORGE BROOKMAN, PRINTER, GLASGOW.

TO THE READER.

THE Volumes of "THE PROTESTANT;" of which a new edition is now offered to the Public, originated in a Newspaper puff about the pretended holiness of the Popish Chapel, lately erected in Glasgow. The exposure of the absurdity of the pretence led to a defence of it by some persons of the Romish communion; and a number of letters on both sides were published in the Glasgow Chronicle, in the summer of 1818. These constitute the first part of Volume First; and what follows is a series of Essays published weekly, for four years, embracing the principal points of controversy between the Church of Rome, on the one hand, and the different communions known by the name of Protestant, on the other. The Author made comparatively little account of the differences of opinion and practice which exist among the latter, not because he thought them unimportant, but because he wished to keep by the one point of exposing the errors, impositions and idolatry of the Papal Church, which make it not only lawful, but the duty of all Christians to separate from her communion; and thus to vindicate the Protestant Churches, in the matter of their separation, whatever mistakes any of them may have fallen into in other respects. His success in this undertaking may be inferred from the high approbation of Protestants of distinguished rank and learning, in each of the three kingdoms; perhaps still more from the approbation of thousands, whose learning consists of little more than their knowledge of the word of God; and perhaps most of all from the almost unparalleled abuse heaped upon him by those whose principles and practices he exposed.

When his labours commenced, it was the opinion of many Protestants that such a work was altogether uncalled for. It was alleged by some, that Popery was greatly ameliorated; and by others, that, in the present enlightened state of society, it would soon die away of itself; that, at least, it was impossible it should ever increase, or gain such a footing in Britain, as to occasion any uneasiness or alarm

"THE PROTESTANT" contributed not a little to remove these mistakes; and recent events have confirmed what he maintained from the beginning,—that Popery is the same that ever it was,—that it is on the increase,—and that Papists are making strenuous efforts especially in Ireland, to recover the ascendancy which they formerly possessed, and which they employed for the extirpation of all who presumed to differ from the Church of Rome, and to believe and worship according to the word of God. Not content with the re-establishment of the Inquisition, and the restoration of the order of Jesuits, they have within the last twelve months, made pretensions of a supernatural kind, in order to impose on the world as they did for ages before the Reformation. They pretend that a saint has arisen among them, possessing miraculous powers, equal to those of any apostle or prophet. This is a German prince of the name of Hohenlohe. It is given out that he has great interest in heaven, particularly with the Virgin Mary and some other saints, so that he can cure the diseases of persons whom he never saw, in any part of the world. To Protestants this appears extremely absurd; they laugh at the folly, and think no more about it—believing it impossible that the world can *now* be deceived by such nonsense. But the fact is, a great part of the world is already deceived by it. These miracles are believed as firmly as any recorded in the Bible. In all the Newspapers in the Popish interest, and these are not few, they are puffed off as undoubted facts. They are copied into others as matters of curiosity; and people soon begin to believe what is incessantly repeated with unhesitating confidence. Learned doctors, including the Popish Bishop of Kildare, are not only not ashamed of them, but they glory in them as incontestable evidence of the truth of their religion, and the holiness of their church. These tricks are performed with such art and imposing solemnity, that the ignorant and credulous of all sects are in danger of being deceived: and the very fact that Papists can now with such unblushing impudence practise these impositions, shows that they find what is called Christendom ready to submit again to the bondage of the dark ages, and to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope of Rome.

One object which the Author kept constantly in view, was to show that Popery has its origin and its seat in the corrupt principles of our depraved nature. The essence of it is alienation from God in his revealed character; and it operates like all other idolatry, in the way of loving and serving the creature in preference to the Creator. This, it is presumed, will be found demonstrated in the

pages of "THE PROTESTANT;" and the consideration of this ought to remove the surprise of those who are surprised by the increase of Popery in this age of light. It is only a heartless assent to an established creed, which is the same thing as indifference to all religion, that constitutes the Protestantism of a vast proportion of our population. These are all no better than Papists at heart. They are under the influence of the same false views of the character of God, and of their own state and character. While they remain indifferent, they may be sufficiently good Protestants according to law; but should their consciences begin to accuse them, and the recollection of their sins make them to feel the dread of a hereafter, they will be in great danger of embracing that religion that affords relief at the easiest rate,—that gives a hope of escaping the wrath to come without such a change of heart and character as would make them hate and forsake their sins. Popery gives relief in this way; and all are prepared to embrace it who wish to "make their peace with God," without being reconciled to him by faith in Christ, and renewed to holiness of life. In an enlightened country many are prevented from embracing it by its ridiculous fooleries; but even these, by becoming familiar, soon become tolerable; and the plausible representations of an artful priesthood seldom fail of success, when brought to bear upon the perverted minds of such nominal Protestants.

The only effectual antidote is the gospel of the grace of God. This exhibits salvation absolutely free to sinners of the human race; and those who are saved must accept the boon as the gift of divine mercy to them as sinners deserving condemnation. Such persons are taught to submit to the righteousness and the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures; to reject all other authority in matters of religion; and thus, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they are preserved from the errors of Popery and every other fatal delusion. To this subject "THE PROTESTANT" has given a prominent place in his pages; and he is not ashamed to acknowledge, that he sometimes went a little out of his way, that he might have the happiness of preaching the gospel to his readers.

From his numerous mercantile and other avocations, he could not find leisure to bestow more care in the composition of his papers than is usually bestowed on mere letters of business. The reader, therefore, must not expect the graces of style in any of them. He studied nothing higher in his composition than to be intelligible; and he is aware that many verbal improvements might be made on a

revisal ; but the pages being stereotyped, do not admit of alteration. By the use of the original plates, however, the present publishers are enabled to issue a new edition much cheaper than if they had to set up the whole anew.

NOTE TO THE REVISED EDITION

THE preceding preface was written on issuing a new and entire edition of the Protestant by the present publishers, four years ago. The demand for the work still continuing and extending, I have been induced to read it carefully over, and make such improvements as seemed necessary, though at the expense to the publishers of casting many of the plates anew. These corrections are almost entirely of a verbal nature, as I scarcely found a sentiment which I wished to alter or exchange. The increasing demand for the work is gratifying to its Author on many accounts, chiefly as indicating an increasing interest in the subjects of it; and it is not the least gratifying circumstance, that it has not only yielded an ample return to the publishers, but also enabled them fully to compensate the loss sustained by the Jury Trial referred to at the end of the fourth volume, which they have done of their own accord, for I had no claim upon them.

W. M'GAVIN.

Glasgow, 20th Sept. 1827.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

SUBJECTS of the Oratorio.....	PAGE 1
Paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle.....	2
Letter to the Editor, animadverting on this paragraph.....	3
Reply by AMICUS VERITATIS.....	4
ANSWER by A PROTESTANT Subject of holy places discussed. A word on Indulgences.....	6
Letter of PAX.....	8
Letter of AMICUS VERITATIS. Hervey quoted as an authority for regarding churches as holy places. Indulgences said to be granted by Luther, &c.....	9
PROTESTANT'S Reply. Word Catholic, &c.....	12
Indulgences. That preached by Tetzels. Bull of Indulgence granted by the present Pope to the people of Cork. Bull for exciting rebellion in Ireland. Indulgences from the modern French catechism. Reflections on the subject.....	15
Another Letter by PAX.....	20
Subject of Indulgences. Tax of the Apostolic Chancery. Testimony of Claude D'Espence. Of Dupin. Luther's alleged Indulgence	22
Another Letter by AMICUS VERITATIS.....	28
PROTESTANT'S Letter on the subject of Indulgences said to have been granted by Luther.....	31
PROTESTANT'S discussion of the subject of Hervey and holy places. Means by which the Popish Chapel in Glasgow was built.....	33
Letter by AMICUS VERITATIS. Denies that the Church of Rome grants Indulgence to commit sin. Charge of Forgery against Protestants,	36
PROTESTANT'S Reply to PAX. Papists preferring the state of things in the dark ages.....	38
Letter of AMICUS VERITATIS. Farther charges of forgery. A pretended quotation from Luther's works. Phillips' oration on bigotry	41
Apparent amelioration of Popery as it appears in Protestant countries, while it is still the same.....	45
Letter to the Readers of the Glasgow Chronicle, announcing the publication of THE PROTESTANT in weekly Numbers.....	48
Advertisement by AMICUS VERITATIS.....	50

PART II.

No. I. Reply to PAX. Indulgences granted by the Pope for thousands of years. Amazing rapacity of the Priests. Douay Catechism, on penance and indulgence.....	1
II. Detection of a false quotation from Luther's works by AMICUS VERITATIS, and Luther vindicated. Term Catholic. Bull of the Pope for extirpating the Waldenses.....	9
III. Authority and character of Popish Priests. <i>Culpa</i> and <i>Pena</i> . Wonderful miracle.....	17

IV. Authority and power of the Pope. His submission to Bonaparte. Transubstantiation.....	PAGE 25
V. Infallibility of the Pope. Impious titles given to him. Singular excommunication	33
VI. Absurdity of calling the Pope Head of the Church. Monstrous wickedness of this Head. The body cannot be pure.....	41
VII. How Papists prove the Pope to be infallible. Peter's alleged supremacy	49
VIII. Peter never Bishop of Rome. Taxes and Absolutions of the Romish Church.....	57
IX. A Parable. Censorship of Books	65
X. Censorship of Books continued. Manner of spending a day by a Papist. Reflections on giving countenance to Popish worship	73
XI. Popery the religion of corrupt human nature. Miraculous effects of Popish baptism. Popish persecution. Instanced in the present state of Protestants in France.....	81
XII. Charge of bigotry fixed upon Papists. Singular instance of it in the case of the Duke of Brunswick. Orthodox Journal against reading the Bible.....	89
XIII. Intolerance of Popery. Instances of persecution. Peter Waldo. Shocking cruelties committed upon the Waldenses. Their peaceful character.....	97
XIV. Establishment of Popery in Scotland. Some Waldenses in England cruelly murdered. Lollards burnt in Glasgow. Patrick Hamilton burnt at St. Andrews. Other instances of persecution in Scotland.....	105
XV. Doctrinal Decision and intolerance of the Belgian Bishops, in the present day. THE PROTESTANT denounced and cursed in the Popish Chapel, Glasgow, on occasion of celebrating High Mass, on Sabbath the 4th of October, 1818. Papists always sounding their own praise. Pope's Bull for licensing brothels. Spotless purity of the priests.....	113
XVI. Protestants regarding Popery with a favourable eye. Nature of Popish Charity. Answers to several parts of AMICUS VERITATIS' Letters.....	121
XVII. The Douay and other Catechisms compared. Their omission or mutilation of the second Commandment. Canisius' Catechism in Scotch.....	129
XVIII. The doctrine of Indulgences calculated to encourage the commission of sin. The doctrine of Christ the reverse of this.....	137
XIX. The subject of discipline in the Church of Scotland discussed. Cutty Stool. Discipline not punishment.....	145
XX. Popish discipline and Excommunication. Case of John, King of England. The Damnation and Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth by Pope Pius V.....	153
XXI. Excommunication of Henry VIII. The Pope's letter to the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against Queen Elizabeth. Indulgences granted by the Pope to Stuckley's crucifixes. Plots of Jesuits. Excommunication of rats, mice, &c.....	161
XXII. Merciful nature, and beneficial effects of church discipline properly conducted. Contrasted with the rigorous nature of Popish discipline and excommunication. Instances of cruelty.....	169
XXIII. Cruelty of Popish discipline illustrated in the case of Mr. Bourke, a Popish Priest in Ireland.....	175
XXIV. Form of Oath required of Papists by King James I. That by Act of King William. That at present in force. Bull of per-	

petual indulgence to the Kings and Queens of France, to break such oaths as they cannot conveniently keep.....	185
XXV. Concerning keeping faith with heretics. Lawfulness of breaking faith with them, proved by several authorities. By the Council of Constance. Recognized by the Council of Trent. Oath of obedience to that Council. Recent instance of a man leaving his wife on account of heresy.....	193
XXVI. The same subject continued. Farther authorities. Declaration of the University of Alcalá. Remarks upon it. Safe conduct granted to John Huss, violated.....	201
XXVII. The same subject continued. Modern Papists ashamed of the doctrine. Doctrine of not keeping faith exemplified by the Inquisition. Lawfulness of putting heretics to death. Modern Papists avow their hope of subverting the present establishment. Misrepresentations of the Orthodox Journal corrected.....	209
XXVIII. The same subject continued. Controversy between Dr. Drummond and Bishop Hay of Edinburgh. Extract from Dr. Porteous' Sermon. All the writers in the Church of Rome for ages maintaining the principle.....	217
XXIX. Farther evidence of the doctrine of the church of Rome with regard to breaking faith. Bishop Lanigan's five reasons for breaking faith. <i>Secreta Monita</i> . Profligacy of the Jesuits. First notice of the <i>THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR</i>	225
XXX. The Church of Rome withholds the Bible from the common people. Rule of the Council of Trent. Controversy between Mr. Scott and W. M. Presumption of the Church of Rome, in assuming the power of permitting, or hindering the reading of the Scriptures.....	233
XXXI. The same subject continued. Church of Rome gradually departs from the doctrine of the Bible. Early translations. Wickliffe. The Pope's Bull against him. Pope Sixtus V. His edition of the Scriptures. Italian mutilated Bible. A correspondent of the Orthodox Journal declares that the Editor has written a better book than the Bible.....	241
XXXII. The same subject continued. The Rhemish Translators. Charge of perverting the Bible answered.....	249
XXXIII. The same subject continued. Proposed Society in London for reprinting and circulating the Douay Bible. Object defeated by the Papists who had promised to further it. Sentiments of a writer in the Orthodox Journal. Story of a Dutch lady. Bull of the present Pope against Bible Societies.....	257
XXXIV. The same subject continued. Inquiry, what evil the Bible has done? The Bible was intended for all men, and ought to be given to all. Opposition to this by Popish Writers. Orthodox Journal against the distribution of the Bible.....	265
XXXV. The same subject continued. The word of God was meant to be made known to all men by the Scriptures. Popish objections to this answered. Decree of the Council of Trent. Dr. Milner against the circulation of the Scriptures.....	275
XXXVI. The same subject continued. Affected regard for the Scriptures. Divine command to write the Word. Cause of the obscurity of some passages. Reflections on the general circulation of the Scriptures.....	281
XXXVII. The same subject continued. Anecdote of a Spaniard. Modern French intolerance. Instances in Ireland of priestly opposition to the Word of God. Effects of reading and preaching. Sentiments of the Popish Translators of the New Testament into French.....	289
XXXVIII. The circulation of cheap tracts recommended. Farther notice of <i>THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR</i> and of his style. He maintains the lawfulness of breaking faith.....	297

XXXIX. Introduction to the subject of Popish idolatry. Glory of the Virgin Mary, by the Rhemish Translators. Wonderful account of St. Ann, the mother of Mary.....	305
XL. Idolatry of Papists. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin by Mr. Andrews. Prayers to her. Litanies, &c.....	313
XLI. Popish idolatry continued. Idolatrous addresses to the Virgin Mary. Mary exalted above all. Her miracles. How they encourage licentiousness.....	321
XLII. Short notice of THE VINDICATOR. Early indication of undue respect for the Mother of Jesus. Reproved by him. Vision of Mary to St. Thomas. View of her Glory. Distinctions of Popish worship. <i>Latria, Dulia</i> , &c. Immense number of prayers which the virgin has to attend to, &c	329
XLIII. Idolatry of saint worship. Christian and saint the same. Affected humility of worshipping God through the medium of saints. Real pride. St. Wenefride.....	337
XLIV. St. Wenefride.....	345
XLV. Apology for giving so much of the nonsense of this saint. Other works published by Mr. Andrews worthy of the dark ages. Popish division of labour among the saints.....	353
XLVI. Discreet variety in objects of Popish worship. Nature of evangelical and Popish worship contrasted. Ridiculous multiplication of saints, &c. St. Viar. Veronica. False ideas of the true God naturally lead to idolatry.....	361
XLVII. Beatification. Canonization. How saints are known by the smell of their bones. Farther proofs of idolatry from Mr. Andrews' prayer to St. Wenefride. How saints know what their votaries pray for, &c.....	369
XLVIII. Worship of images. Proved idolatrous. Great authorities for such worship. Council of Trent. Images of the Trinity, &c.....	377
XLIX. Image worship continued. The golden calf supposed to represent Joseph. Miraculous power ascribed to images. St. Dominic. His character, and the worship which is paid to him. Detection of a Popish miracle in Scotland.....	385
L. Interview with two papists. Declarations of three witnesses, proving the truth of the story of the man in the Wynd. Reflections upon it.....	393

THE
Protestant,

PART I.

THE publication of the PROTESTANT has excited so much interest, and has been so favourably received by the public, that I have been induced to reprint my Letters which were published in the Glasgow Chronicle; and, that I may do my opponents all justice, I shall also reprint theirs, in the order in which they originally appeared before the world. I shall begin, by giving the subjects which were performed at the *Oratorio*, with a translation of them into English; and also the paragraph which occasioned this controversy. “Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth.”

ORATORIO.

The Oratorio to consist of the following Selection:

PART FIRST.

Grand Symphony, composed for the occasion, by Mr. De Monti, sen. (Organ by Mr. C. J. A. De Monti, accompanied by the Military Band.)
Credo in unum Deum—I believe in one God.....*Chorus.*
Genitum non factum—begotten, not made.....*Contr' Alto Solo.*
Et incarnatus est—and hath become flesh.....*Quartett.*
Et resurrexit tertia die—and rose on the third day...*Chorus.*
Confiteor unum baptismum—I confess one baptism.....*Basso Solo.*
Lucis Creator optime—best Creator of light.....*Chorus.*
Adeste Fideles, (or Portuguese Hymn)—be present
ye faithful.....*Chorus.*
Deum de Deo—God from God—variation 1st to the
preceding.*Soprano Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.

Cantet nunc Io. 2d var.—let him sing now Io.....*Contr' Alter Solo.*
 Chorus da Capo.
 Ergo qui natus, 3d var.—therefore who hath been born. *Tenore Solo.*
 Chorus da Capo.

PART SECOND.

Gloria in excelsis Deo—Glory to God among the lofty
 ones.....*Chorus Concertante*
 Laudamus te—We praise thee.....*Duett 2 Soprani.*
 Domine Deus—O Lord God.....*Tenore Solo.*
 Qui tollis peccata mundi—who takest away the sins
 of the world.....*Chorus.*
 Quoniam tu solus sanctus—since thou alone art holy...*Trio.*
 Cum Sancto Spiritu—with the Holy Spirit.....*Chorus.*
 Te Deum laudamus—We praise thee God.....*Chorus.*
 Te Gloriosus Apostolorum Chorus—thee the glorious
 choir of the Apostles.....*Duett 2 Soprani.*
 To ad Liberandum—thou for delivering.....*Chorus.*
 Te ergo quæsumus—we beseech thee therefore.....*Tenore Solo.*
 Per singulos Dies—every day.....*Quartett.*
 Dignare Domine—vouchsafe, O Lord.....*Contr' Alto Solo.*
 Misere nostri Domine—have mercy on us, O Lord,...*Soprano Solo.*
 Fiat misericordia tua—let thy mercy be done.....*Quartett.*
 In te Domine speravi—upon thee, Lord, I have placed
 my hope.....*Chorus.*
 Et ne nos inducas in tentationem—and lead us not
 into temptation—(from the Pater Noster).*Chorus.*
 Sed libera nos a malo—but deliver us from evil—
 (from the Pater Noster)*Chorus.*
 Domine salvum fac Regem—God save the King—
 (or Prayer for the King)*Chorus.*
 To conclude with an extempore Voluntary on the Organ, by Mr. De
 Monti, sen.

“ We feel pleasure in noticing the numerous and respectable auditory which was assembled at the Oratorio on Thursday last. The zeal and activity of the directors, the alacrity and pleasure with which their solicitations, in behalf of a charitable and philanthropic institution, were complied with, the great respect paid alike to the subject and the place, form a pleasing and characteristic feature of the age, and must afford an inexhaustible fund of pleasing reflection to the contemplative Christian. May we not hope that these reasons, and the general satisfaction afforded by the performance, will induce Bishop Cameron to grant his permission for another Oratorio at a future period. We cannot close the subject, without offering our mead of praise to Mr. De Monti for his extraordinary exertions, which the shortness of the notice required.”—*Glasgow Chron.* May 23d, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

THERE are two or three words in your paper of last Saturday, on which I beg leave to animadvert a little. They are in the paragraph relating to the Oratorio in the Catholic Chapel:—‘The great respect paid *alike to the subject and the place.*’ I hope that the highly respectable company which assembled in the Catholic Chapel, last Thursday, paid great respect to the subject that was said or sung there that day. I can conceive no subject so important and interesting to a devout mind. It embraces nothing less than the salvation of the world by the incarnation and death of the Son of God. I think it impossible that any Christian should make this a subject of amusement; and it was right to regard it with all possible respect and devotion. But it appears to me somewhat strange, that they should have paid the like respect to the *place*. Does the writer of the paragraph really believe that the building is as much to be respected, or to be regarded with the same kind of respect, as the most solemn passages of the word of God? Does he in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic Chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour the Town’s Hospital; or of its other neighbour the Glass Bottle Manufactory? I know there is a Church every stone of which is holy; but this is neither the High Church of Glasgow, nor St. George’s, nor the Tabernacle, nor yet the Catholic Chapel in Clyde Street.

The Society for educating Roman Catholics is founded upon the best principles, and is entitled to the liberal support of Protestants. In teaching poor Catholics to read, we do not profess to make them Protestants; and it is not fair to represent us as having become Catholics, because we patronize such an institution. But if it be true that we paid respect alike to the subject, and the place where the Oratorio was performed, we have embraced one of the worst tenets of Popery—we are putting the work of a man on a footing with the work of God.

The writer of the paragraph expresses a hope that Bishop Cameron will grant permission to have another such exhibition. And is it come to this, that the Protestants in Glasgow must have the permission of a Roman Catholic Bishop to sing the praise of their Maker; that they must use only such words as he shall prescribe; and that these words must be, to the most of those who use them, in an unknown tongue? If it be possible that any person should consider it as a matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop is nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

HAVING perceived in your paper of Thursday, a Letter from "A PROTESTANT," I beg leave to remark, in very few words, on the matter which it contains. Nor let it be understood that it is the spirit of recrimination which makes me trespass on the public, but a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious bigotry:

"Curst be the verse, how well soe'er it flow,
"That tends to make one worthy man my foe!"

I saw the paragraph which your correspondent alludes to, and am certainly astonished at the handle which he has made of it: paying respect to the house of God seems to have given him very great offence, and drawn from him a question as ridiculous as it is shameful:—"Does he (the writer of the paragraph) in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic Chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour the Town's Hospital; or of its other neighbour the Glass Bottle Manufactory?" According to the same principle, I suppose your correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the Green of Glasgow; or that the Temple of Jerusalem, which I believe was partly composed of "stones and timber," was not more sacred than the Theatre: yet we are informed, in the sacred Scriptures, that our Saviour was so offended at the disrespect paid to his house, that he not only reproached the buyers and sellers therein, but even personally chastised them.

Were we to analyze all things that have been called holy, we would find them to consist in substance of mere matter; but the union or combination of matter, its application to pious purposes, and its consecration to Almighty God, certainly is not unworthy of being "called holy," and consequently deserving of a more sacred regard than the property of a glass-blower, or even a town's hospital.

From the remark of your correspondent respecting Popish indulgences, I was led to examine the Douay Catechism, from which I learn that the meaning of an indulgence is entirely different from what he would insinuate; indeed, if it were the case that Popish Bishops could have granted indulgences to commit sin, Henry the Eighth would never have professed himself a Protestant.

Thank Heaven! "the phantoms raised by bigotry and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason;" the darkness which for a time overspread our horizon, is dissipating into the

more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy; and the institution for the education of Roman Catholics, if it still meet with the encouragement which already has marked its progress, will be a lasting monument to future ages of the charity of its supporters and conductors.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

IF I were to choose the name of an opponent in controversy, I would not fix on one more to my mind than AMICUS VERITATIS. I see, in your paper of Thursday, a Letter under this signature, containing some remarks on my Letter which appeared in your paper of the Thursday preceding; and, presuming your correspondent to be what he calls himself, I shall proceed to reply, without the least apprehension of "making one honest man my foe."

If I had been sure that the writer of the paragraph relating to the Oratorio was a Catholic, I should perhaps have expressed myself in a manner somewhat different. I should not have put it as a question whether the writer regarded the stones and timber of his Chapel more holy than the materials of its two conspicuous neighbours; I should have taken it for granted that he did. But this would have made no difference in the nature of my remarks. The writer was speaking of a congregation, the bulk of whom were Protestants, and he stated that they paid great respect alike to the place and to the subject. This I thought could be true only on one or other of two suppositions; either that they had abandoned their Protestantism, and become Papists; or that they considered the subject as a mere matter of amusement, and then they might respect the place as much as the subject. I did not suppose that Christians could make so solemn a subject the matter of amusement; I could not allow myself to believe that so many of my friends and neighbours had all at once become Papists and therefore I concluded that the reporter, whoever he was, had given an unfair statement.

AMICUS VERITATIS comes forward to vindicate the statement, and the sentiments implied in it, with regard to the holiness of the place; and he does so candidly and plainly, so as to make it evident that he is a Catholic. He, of course, believes the Chapel to be as holy as a Bishop can make it; I believe so too; and

yet I believe it is not more holy than the Bottle-Work or the Town's Hospital. Persons who believe that a Priest can create his own Creator; or that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; may very easily believe that a Bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants, I mean enlightened and consistent Protestants, believe neither the one nor the other: and what I originally found fault with was, the statement which represented a Protestant assembly as regarding the place with the like respect as they regarded the most solemn passages of the word of God.

AMICUS VERITATIS is perfectly right when he says, "According to the same principle, I suppose your Correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the Green of Glasgow." I frankly confess that I regard the one as no more holy than the other, but for the *divine Presence* which was manifested on the former. Wherever the Almighty makes himself known, by visible or sensible tokens of his presence, that I should regard as a holy place; but I have never heard of him doing so in the Catholic Chapel, and therefore I must be excused from putting it upon a footing with the place where Moses stood in the wilderness, or with the Temple in Jerusalem, where, in a mysterious, but sensible manner, the Almighty communed with his people from between the cherubims, and from above the mercy-seat.

Your Correspondent forgets that these things belonged to a dispensation which has long since passed away, and given place to a better one. In the hour of our Saviour's crucifixion, the vail of the temple was rent from top to bottom. The holy place was then laid open to all the world, and it was a holy place no longer. From that moment there was no house in the world more holy than another; and the words of Christ began to be fulfilled, "Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall we worship the Father: but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth." I most earnestly recommend the consideration of this subject to AMICUS VERITATIS; and if he be indeed what his name imports, I hope he will soon see and acknowledge the absurdity of considering any thing holy which is made by human hands.

It is an assembly of Christians, not the place in which they meet, that is the house, or a house of God; and such a house I believe to be holy, because Christ is present with them, though they be but two or three in number; and because they are holy persons, saved by his grace, and sanctified by his Spirit. This house is not the work of man, it is a "building of God."

A word or two on the subject of indulgences. My remarks, it seems, led AMICUS VERITATIS to look into the Douay Catechism to see what an indulgence is. I wish he had indulged me with a quotation, to assist my understanding with regard to the *modern* meaning of the word; for I am not so rich as to possess a Douay Catechism. But I do not need any modern writing to inform me that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin: for instance, he professed to relieve individuals, and whole nations, from the obligation of an oath. He claimed farther the power of granting to individuals and families a full remission of all their sins, past and future, which probably would operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons knew beforehand that they had got a full pardon. I am assured by a Reverend Gentleman of this city, that he has seen a bull of the Pope, granted as a special mark of his favour to the head of the ancient family of Kilravack. It is signed by the then Pope's own hand, and grants the most pleasing remission of *all* their sins, to *all the branches* of that family, from the time of granting the bull to a period of which there are about sixty years yet to run.

I am not at present disposed to turn over books of history, else, I doubt not, I could easily show, that it was no unwillingness on the part of the Pope to grant indulgence to commit sin, which prevented him from indulging Henry the Eighth in his wicked project. It is nor fair to call that man a Protestant who did little more than transfer the headship of the Church from the Pope to himself.

It is gratifying to be informed that the Catholic Schools are flourishing: but it ought not to be forgotten, that they originated with, and are chiefly supported by, Protestants. While the Catholics were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the House of God, (while a plain building might have served their purpose,) they were suffering their poor to grow up, and to perish in ignorance; and it might have been so still but for Protestant benevolence.

It is amusing to hear a Catholic charging his Protestant neighbour with bigotry; and thanking Heaven that "the darkness which *for a time* overspread our horizon is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy." I suppose the time here referred to, is that which has elapsed since the Reformation; and, of course, the light which is now about to arise is that of the *dark ages*!

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

IT was not my intention to have noticed your Correspondent's letter, signed "A PROTESTANT," containing remarks on a paragraph which appeared immediately after the Oratorio; and I am sorry that AMICUS VERITATIS has done so, because it has brought forth from him a second letter, in your Paper of Saturday last, which I am compelled to answer. I will quarrel with no man for his religious opinions, whatever they may be; and I respect his feelings too much to turn them into ridicule. My purpose is not to enter into a controversy with your Correspondent on the subject between him and AMICUS VERITATIS; but to repel principles falsely attributed to others, and endeavour to make him feel, if possible, the injustice of his uncharitable remark at the conclusion of his letter. Your Correspondent seems to assume the privilege of determining what another body of Christians understand by the word indulgence, and that the Catholic must abide by his definition; and brings forth the report of a Rev. Gentleman, who assures him he has seen a bull of the Pope, granting the pleasing remission of all the sins of the ancient house of Kilravack, for sixty years yet unexpired. Really, Mr. Editor, it is a very unpleasant task to convict any man of committing a mistake, and still more galling to see a whole body of people charged unjustly with professing principles as repugnant to their feelings as to common sense. Your Correspondent may have been informed of this; the Rev. Gentleman may have seen some old Latin scrip, or even a bull; yet I will defy him or any one to produce it, or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it,—or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sins. It is at best a gross misinterpretation. Bulls and indulgences are so mingled by your Correspondent, that he pretends not to know the meaning of either, nor will he be troubled to turn over the leaves of history to ascertain it; but receives the interpretations of these words from the enemies of the Catholic religion, and thus grounds his charge.

A spirit of irony so prevails throughout your Correspondent's letters, that I conceive him to be solely actuated by prejudice, or else why those epithets of Papists, Popish, Wafer, &c.? which originated in derision, and were fostered by bigotry. A quarto edition of a Dictionary, lying before me, says, "Papist, an odious term made use of by Protestants when they speak of Catholics." The Catholics do not admit of these appellations; our houses of Parliament do not make use of them: why then, if he wishes

not "to make one honest man his foe," does he use derision to insult them.

Your Correspondent's observations on the Catholic Schools ought never to have been penned, when penned never to have been printed. They breathe a spirit in direct opposition to the principles of its supporters, who act from motives of pure charity and philanthropy, and, by their generosity and candour, win the grateful hearts of their fellow-creatures. He, by reproaches, tries to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug. A little while and it shall be found rooted to the hilt.

Your Correspondent may trouble the public with a reply as I have done; but were he to write till the indulgence granted to the house of Kilravack is expired, on religious opinions, to provoke a controversy, I would be silent; but you shall ever find me ready to crush prejudice by stating the truth.

PAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

I HAVE perceived in your Paper of Saturday, a second attack upon the writer of the paragraph relative to the Oratorio, together with some animadversions on my letter of Thursday.

Your Correspondent very ingeniously endeavours to refute what I said regarding that respect which *ought* to be paid to places appropriated for the celebration of the praise of our Creator, and so far does he proceed upon the principle he has laid down, as to assert, that all "enlightened and consistent Protestants," regard a church with as little respect as they would pay to a place of common amusement. I must necessarily suppose, when your Correspondent made this assertion he was not aware that many "enlightened and consistent Protestants" do not agree with him; among the rest the celebrated Mr. HERVEY, whose authority gives a zest to all I have advanced on this subject. This "enlightened" Protestant Divine writes thus in the commencement of his "Meditations among the Tombs:" he is walking to a church in the county of Cornwall, when he describes "the doors, like the heaven to which they lead, were wide open, and readily admitted an unworthy stranger. Pleased with the opportunity, I resolved to spend a few minutes under the *sacred* roof." He is even more explicit; he calls places of worship "our Creator's courts," and "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Here, then, is an authority which your Correspondent will not

surely call in question, breathing the very same sentiments which were the spirit of what I formerly advanced on the subject. I presume when Mr. HERVEY termed places of worship "*sacred*," it was far from his intention to suppose the materials of which they were composed were holy, but only in relation to that Almighty Being to whose service they were dedicated; indeed there is an innate principle in man, which, when his soul is elevated by piety and devotion, instinctively prompts him to regard with veneration, "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it is to be dedicated? "The treasures of nature and of art are ransacked to adorn the palaces of earthly kings, and shall we not employ them to build a house to the King of kings and Lord of lords?" "It must grieve," says Mr. HERVEY, "an ingenuous mind, and be a reproach to any people, to have their own houses wainscotted with cedar, and painted with vermillion, while the temple of the Lord of hosts is destitute of every decent ornament." I think your Correspondent might have been more sparing in his *reproaches* against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit; and for raising a building which, for ages to come, will adorn and ornament our city.

With respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your Correspondent that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and whatever he may say with regard to the *ancient* or *modern* meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions. As he mentions a Pope having granted an indulgence (which in all likelihood is a forgery,) to "the ancient family of Kilravack," I hope he will have the goodness to accept in return one or two Protestant indulgences. The first was published by the pious Luther, and contains a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances. That it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your Correspondent to 119 and 123 pages Fifth Volume of the Works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg. The second was an indulgence granted by Luther and seven other Divines to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time. For the edification of the public, I shall extract a few passages translated into English. The Bull itself may be seen in the original Latin in Bossuet's *Variations*, L. vi. In his declaration to Luther and Melancthon, the Landgrave had informed them that he had never loved his wife; that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks; and

that he could not abandon the dissolute state of life in which he lived. For these reasons, he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer, after some preliminary observations, they proceed thus:—"But if your Highness do not abstain from an impure life, because you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that your Highness were in a better state before God. —But if your Highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly as we have said above with respect to the dispensation; that is to say, that none but the lady herself, and a few trusty persons obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession, know any thing of the matter. Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses; and though the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent would understand this moderate method of life, and prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all go right with conscience. Your Highness hath, therefore, not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the considerations which we have made thereupon. We are most ready to serve your Highness. Dated at Wirtemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1538.—Signed Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bacer, Anthony Corvan, Adam John Liningue, Justus Wintforte, Dionysius Melanther."

I have often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that, in Great Britain, Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief. Of the myriads of declaimers against Popery, with which this kingdom abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the Right Reverend Divine who instructs his brethren the Clergy of the Diocese, there is not one who does not appear to claim a more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves. Their decisions are more infallible than those of the Roman Pontiff. It is in vain that Catholics disclaim the odious tenets which are imputed to them; in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils: their complaints are disregarded, and their protestations treated with contempt: the obstinacy of their adversaries will neither yield to argument nor authority. Objections which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward as demonstrations of their folly and impiety; and the misrepresentations of prejudice are eagerly received with the veneration due to simple unvarnished truth.

Your Correspondent may reply; but as I do not perceive any good which can be produced to the institution, by maintaining a

controversy, I hope I shall be excused if I decline troubling you with any more of my remarks.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

I OBSERVE two letters in your Paper of yesterday, in reply to mine in that of Saturday last, the one signed PAX, the other by my former opponent, AMICUS VERITATIS. It is a sad thing for me, Sir, to have both Peace and Truth against me; but as I am not conscious of having provoked either of them, and as I am sure neither of them can hurt me, I can cheerfully meet them with open face. Both of them write in a temperate style. The former, indeed, seems a little angry; but the latter appears to be in very good humour: and, so far as I can judge of my own temper, I think there is nothing inconsistent with a state of good humour in any thing that I have yet written on this subject. It is my wish to preserve the same state of mind, in replying to the formidable host which is now mustered against me.

PAX says, he was compelled to answer my last letter; and I shall not be sorry if he feels himself also compelled to answer this one, if it should be at the period when the bull in behalf of the Kilravack family has expired; until which period he declares he will not answer me, for, by that time, he will be a pretty old man, although he should be only a stripling now: and surely he cannot say I wish him ill, because I wish he may live to a great age.

He accuses me of writing in "a spirit of irony;" and this is a part of his letter which I do not controvert. There are some things so extremely absurd, as to defy all serious argument; on which, "to be grave, exceeds all power of face;" and the solemn parade about the holiness of the Popish Chapel, appeared to me to be one of these things! The claim seemed to me so extremely ludicrous, that it was difficult to treat it in a serious manner. Yet, believing the pages of your Paper, notwithstanding the nonsense that sometimes appears in them, to be as holy as the said Chapel, I did introduce some very serious matters, which I recommended to the serious consideration of AMICUS VERITATIS; and I am sorry to say, I see no evidence of his having considered them

I say now the Popish, not the Catholic Chapel, because I see PAX attaches great importance to the distinction, and feels offended by my use of the former word. I must maintain that his offence on this account is very unreasonable; and that it is unreasonable to expect that Protestants should give up the question which they have been contesting with Papists for three hundred years, which they must do, if they yield to them the exclusive property of the word Catholic. Every Christian is a Catholic, in the legitimate sense of the word. We profess to believe in the "Holy Catholic Church," that is, in the existence of a holy and spiritual assembly, separated from the world which lieth in wickedness. This assembly consists of all the saints in heaven, and all on earth who are saved by the grace, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. This, however, is a very different Church from the Church of Rome, though I do not doubt that members of the Church of Rome belong to it. Now, to grant to the Papist the exclusive property of the word Catholic, is to concede to him what, indeed he arrogantly claims, but to which he has no just right—the exclusive title to be a member of the true Church.

On what other ground does PAX consider the word Papist a term of reproach? or on what other ground does he insist upon us calling him and his brethren Catholics, but that we may concede to them the point that they only are Christians, and that all we are heretics? But I will not yield that point to him, or any body else. Papist is the distinctive name of those who believe in the sovereign and supreme authority of the Pope in religious matters. Those who hold certain points of doctrine are called Calvinists, though they never professed to believe in Calvin, or to embrace all his dogmas; and why should those who do profess to believe in the divine authority and infallibility of the Pope, think it a reproach to be called after his name? Let every sect be called after the name of its god, and Papists will be found the proper name of PAX and his brethren.

That the word Catholic, and not Papist, is used in both Houses of Parliament, is a proof of the courtesy and good nature of noblemen and gentlemen, who do not much trouble themselves about religious distinctions; but it is one among many evidences of a growing indifference to the great questions at issue between Protestants and Papists. While the two words are used indifferently, it is, perhaps, of little importance; but whenever the exclusive right to the word Catholic shall be generally conceded to the Church of Rome and its members, Protestants will have gone far to shake hands with the Pope, if not to kiss his great toe.

This gentleman accuses me of using another term of reproach, to wit, *Wafer*. This appears to me a very soft and harmless word. I did not know that there was any evil in it: But the fact is, there is no such word in my letter. I used the common words bread and wine: and I did mean it to be understood, that a Papist believes that his priest can, by the use of certain words, turn these into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; that is, that he can create his own Creator! and, as neither of my opponents controvert this part of my letter, it must be understood that they acquiesce in it.

I am next blamed for so mingling bulls and indulgences, as not to pretend to know the meaning of either. The word bull occurs only twice in my long letter; and the word indulgence stands at such a respectful distance, that it does not appear how they are mingled: but it is of more importance to attend to the subject than the mingling of words; and here I have to remark, before I proceed, that your compositor mistook a word in my manuscript, which was written without much care. You printed ‘pleasing remission,’ instead of ‘plenary remission.’ PAX quotes the erroneous reading, and then he triumphantly defies me, “or any one to produce it, (i. e. the bull,) or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it; or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin.” Now, I dare say it could not be produced with that word in it; but of its existence and authenticity I have not a doubt. It is esteemed such a precious relick by the head of the family that possesses it, (merely, however, I believe, as a piece of curiosity and antiquity), that he refused to let it out of his possession, when urgently requested to permit its publication. For farther information on this point, I shall refer to the Rev. Gentleman who actually saw it, who is, I am told, at present from home; but who will, I doubt not, on his return answer for himself.

It seems, Mr. Editor, you are, art and part, guilty in one of my transgressions. My “observations on the Catholic Schools ought never to have been penned, and when penned ought never to have been printed.” My only observations with regard to these Schools were,—it was gratifying to be informed that they were flourishing; and that they originated with, and were chiefly supported by, Protestants. Where is the great evil of these observations? The latter is notoriously true; and the former I believe to be true on the testimony of AMICUS VERITATIS. I believe it is an observation of mine which immediately follows, that has offended PAX, and makes him feel so sore. “While he and his friends were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the House of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance. Now,

this is a fact which deserves to be printed every day, and it should be sounded in the ears of Papists, till they be convinced of their sin, and make confession. When this is done, I shall gladly let the subject drop for ever.

The subject of indulgences shall have a prominent place in my next letter; and, in those which follow, I intend to go over and answer every objectionable sentiment advanced by your two Correspondents. It is by no means a difficult task which I have undertaken. To use an expression of one of your late Correspondents, on another subject,—there is so much “tempting matter,” that it is difficult to let it alone. I must request you to indulge me with a little space in your Paper for a few days, when you have nothing more important to fill it up.

Meantime, I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

GLASGOW, 12th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

IN my first letter on this controversy, I said that, if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS says that the Douay Catechism gives a different meaning to the word indulgence than that which I insinuate. I have called upon him to give the modern meaning of the term, according to the Catechism, but this he has not done, nor yet his coadjutor PAX. Both of them tell me it is not what I suppose it to be; but neither of them will tell me what it is. Now, what is the meaning of this concealment, this mystery about the meaning of a word? Is it because, modified as it may be by modern refinement, it is still too bad to bear the light of a Protestant hemisphere?

My first assertion did not go into the niceties of its ancient or modern meaning. The truth of what I said seems self-evident. If it be a sin to make the word of God a subject of amusement, then the Bishop's permission to do so is a Popish indulgence to commit sin, else Bishop Cameron is not a Popish Bishop. My strongest assertion on this subject was, that “the Pope claimed and exercised the power of granting permission to commit sin; for instance, he professed to relieve individuals, and whole nations, from the obligation of an oath.” This is not denied by either of my opponents; and I maintain, whatever the ecclesiastical

meaning of the word may be, that this is nothing less, in the plain sense of the English words, than an indulgence, or permission, to commit sin. This, indeed, they may call a dispensation, not an indulgence; but it does not alter the nature of the thing.

I did not expect that your Correspondents would have committed themselves so far as to have asserted, "that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins;" or, that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." It will be recollected, by some of your readers, that a Reverend Gentleman of that communion, a few years ago, publicly maintained, that it never was a principle of his Church to withhold the Scriptures from the common people; and that, when the authority of the Council of Trent was quoted against him, he was then indeed PAX! that is, hush! not a word more! Papists have, of late, received so much countenance, and even flattery, from Protestants, that perhaps they are bolder, now they think the ball is at their foot; and they expect to get Britain back to the communion of the Holy See. I do not therefore expect that they will acquiesce so quietly in the statements which I am now about to make, and the authorities which I am going to quote.

The following is a translation of the bull, or, if it be more agreeable to my opponents, the indulgence, or absolution, which was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the Pope; and which was so instrumental in helping forward the Reformation. "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by his most holy passion; and I, by his authority, and that of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy Pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and, then, from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Holy See; and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in Purgatory on their account, and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism; so that, when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delight shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This was enforced by the preaching of Tetzel, who declared, that if any man purchased letters of indulgence, his soul might rest secure with respect to salvation. Will PAX, or

his brother, after reading this, assert, that “by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins?”

I have before me an English version of another letter of indulgence, which was granted by the present Pope to the good people of Cork “Pius VII. by divine Providence, Pope, grants unto each, and every one of the faithful in Christ, who, after assisting, at least eight times, at the holy exercise of the mission (in the new Cathedral of Cork), shall confess his or her sins, with true contrition, and approach unto the holy communion, shall devoutly visit the said Cathedral Chapel, and then offer up to God, for some space of time, pious and fervent prayers, for the propagation of the Catholic faith, and to the intention of our holy father, a plenary indulgence applicable to the souls in purgatory, by way of suffrage, and this in form of a jubilee.” Now, let any man figure to himself the good zealous Papists of Cork, after having washed away all their own sins, by assisting at least eight times at the holy exercise of the mission, by true contrition, by pious and fervent prayers offered up to God for some space of time, receiving a plenary indulgence in the form of a jubilee; let any one witness this jubilee, and reflect that it is granted by the special favour of the Pope, and let him say, if it be not true that the Pope does, even to this day, grant indulgence to commit sin.

I shall indulge your readers with another bull of the Pope relating to Ireland. It was produced in the Court of King’s Bench on the trial of Connor, Lord Macquire, Feb. 10th, 1644, —*State Trials*, vol. I. p. 464:—

Ad futuram Rei Memoriam Urbanus Octavus, &c. It recites, “that having taken into his serious consideration the great zeal of the Irish towards the propagating of the Catholic faith; which kingdom (for their singular fervency in the true worship of God) was of old called the Land of Saints: And having certain notice, that, in imitation of their godly and worthy ancestors, they endeavoured by force of arms to deliver their thrall’d nation from the oppressions of the heretics, and to extirpate those workers of iniquity, who had infected the mass of Catholic purity with the pestiferous leaven of their heretical contagion, by virtue of his power of binding and loosing, which God hath conferred upon him; to all and every the aforesaid Christians in the kingdom of Ireland, so long as they should militate against the said heretics and other enemies of the Catholic faith, he did grant a full and plenary indulgence, and absolute remission of all their sins, desiring all of them to be partakers of this precious treasure; dated from the Vatican, or St. Peter’s Palace in Rome, May 25th, 1643, and in the twentieth year of his pontificate.” Under this plenary indulgence, the Papists of Ireland murdered many thou-

sands of their Protestant neighbours. After reading this, will your Correspondents assert, that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin, or that it never was the practice of the Pope to grant permission to commit sin? If they will still assert this, then they must admit that it is no sin to murder Protestants.

I have not been able to procure a Douay Catechism: and, as AMICUS VERITATIS will not inform me what meaning is given by it to the word Indulgence, I must find it out from another quarter. I have before me "A Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, to which are prefixed the Pope's Bull, and the Archbishop's Mandamus. Translated from the original, with an Introduction and Notes, by David Bogue." For the edification of your readers, I shall transcribe Lesson xxi. It has all the authority and infallibility that the Pope can give it, as I suppose the Douay Catechism also has: it cannot therefore be materially different, for it is impossible that two things on the same doctrine, materially different, can proceed from an infallible source.

"Of INDULGENCES. Q. What does faith teach us concerning indulgences? A. That the church has received from Jesus Christ the power of granting them, and that the use of them is very salutary to Christians.—Q. Why are indulgences so salutary? A. Because they are established to moderate the rigours of the temporal pains due to sin.—Q. Is it necessary to know precisely how this rigour is moderated? A. No: it is sufficient to believe that a good mother, like the church, gives nothing to her children, but what really serves to relieve them in this world and in the next.—Q. Is it the intention of the church to free us by indulgences from the obligation of God? A. No: the mind of the church is, on the contrary, to grant indulgences, only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.—Q. Of what use are indulgences? A. They are of much use to us in every way, since we have always reason to believe that we are very far from having satisfied according to our obligations.—Q. What follows from hence? A. That we should be our own enemies, if we had not recourse to the graces and indulgences of the church.—Q. What then, in a word, is the intention of the church, in the dispensation of indulgences? A. It is to assist well-meaning Christians to clear themselves in regard to God, and make up their infirmity.—Q. What does she intend by that? A. To excite more and more in the heart, piety and love to God, conformably to the word of our Lord,—he to whom much is given, ought also to love much.—Q. What is the best disposition to obtain indulgences? A. Doing, in the best manner we can, what is prescribed to obtain them, and wait the effect of them from the mercy of God, who alone knows the secrets of the heart.—

Q. On what are indulgences founded? A. On the satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the saints.—Q. Why do you add the satisfaction of the saints to that of Jesus Christ? A. Because of the goodness of God, who is willing, on the behalf of his most pious servants, to forgive the others.—Q. Why besides? A. Because the satisfaction of the saints are united to that of Jesus Christ, whence they derive all their value.—Q. Who has a right to give indulgences? A. The Pope in the whole church, and the bishops in their dioceses, with the limitations appointed by the church.”

Such is the precious doctrine of the infallible Church respecting indulgences. I would appeal to your types, if they were capable of receiving an appeal, whether they were ever employed in putting together such a jumble of impiety and nonsense? From this document I am enabled to take higher ground. I maintain now, not only that the Pope, and the Church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin, but that they actually command it. They make it the duty of a Papist to commit sin. I rest this very heavy charge on the answer to the fourth question above quoted:—“The mind of the church is, to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the *duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.*” Perhaps some of your Protestants readers will not, at first sight, perceive the enormous wickedness of this; but I appeal to every serious and enlightened Christian, whether he can imagine greater wickedness than an attempt to do what God has declared that it is impossible that a creature can do; and what he declares to be already perfectly accomplished, not by a mere creature, but by his own Son? The revelation of divine mercy by Jesus Christ, and the command to believe in him, is virtually a command to cease from every attempt to satisfy divine justice for ourselves, or to make our peace with God; but the Church of Rome sets its miserable votaries to a work which it is not only impossible for them to do, but the very attempt to do which is an act of rebellion against God. To satisfy divine justice! The man who attempts to do this, or who thinks he can do it, must have as low ideas of the divine Being, as the man who sees and worships his God in a stock or a stone, or any other work of his own hands. Hence the connexion of this doctrine of indulgences with the worship of saints and images, and the uniting the merit of the saints with that of the Saviour, which shows that the poor Papist looks upon God as such a one as himself. Christ has satisfied divine justice by the sacrifice of himself once for all; and every man that believes in him becomes interested in that sacrifice; the justice of God is satisfied with regard to him; the anger of God is turned away from him, he needs no other sacrifice or satisfaction; and instead of attempting to satisfy divine justice by his own penances, or the

divine law by his own doings, he is taught, from a principle of love and gratitude, as a saved sinner, to live a life of humility and obedience to his heavenly Father. This is the true Catholic; this is a member of the church universal, which unites the earth to heaven.

But the Papist is taught by his church to satisfy divine justice for himself; and, if he cannot make it entirely out, he gets the grace and indulgences of the church, and the merits of the saints, to help him; and, if all should be too little, he has a *corps de reserve* in the merits of Christ, to which, however, he will not likely apply if he can do better. This subject is too serious for ridicule; it is delusion and imposition all over, and the effect of it is to ruin the souls of men. He that rejects the sacrifice of Christ, or who places any confidence whatever in his own merits, or the merits of any creature, refuses the only remedy which divine mercy has provided for the salvation of our fallen race; and by disbelieving the divine testimony concerning the Saviour, he is guilty of the dreadful wickedness of calling the God of truth a liar. Many Protestants, I am afraid, are guilty of the same thing; but it is of the nature of Popery to make men do so; and the Romish Church authoritatively not only indulges, but commands the commission of sin.

In my next letter I shall discuss this subject a little further, and then advert to the indulgences granted by Luther and the other Reformers.

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

GLASGOW, 15th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

WHEN I concluded my last letter, and declined answering your Correspondent, I did so with the conviction that no additional provocation would emanate from his pen until he had settled the previous question; but, as Addison observes, "it is indeed impossible to kill the weed, the soil has a natural inclination to produce." I feel myself forcibly called upon to notice his letter of Saturday last, which, if I had no other, is a convincing proof of the truth of my remarks. He argues, as yet, on mere supposition, unsupported by a single fact, and is silent on those truths opposed to his fallacious assertions.

I will strictly adhere to my first principle of avoiding a controversy on the differences of religious opinions. My object is not to throw my gauntlet in the face of every man who does not think as I do ; but to crush prejudices by opposing truth to error, and the olive branch to the spirit of persecution. Who can blame me, in this enlightened country, where men are allowed the full freedom of conscience, and where, I hope, these sparks of prejudice are only emitting the faint light of an expiring fire ?

Every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance made by your Correspondent in his last letter, whereby he occupies twenty-four lines of your columns in comparing his own temper with that of his opponent, and calculating how old I shall be when the Kilravack Bull expires. This is not to the purpose : I defied him to produce the Bull, *with the meaning he ascribes to it*, even allowing the benefit of the errata he claims ; and it may not be irrelevant here to observe, that it is rather unfortunate for your Correspondent, that the proprietors (perhaps the manufacturers) of the Bull will not allow the publication of it, which might be effected easily without dispossessing themselves of it, and that the Rev. Gentleman who is reported to have seen it should be out of town. I also defied him to prove, that by an indulgence was meant the remission of sins, (for a person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence,) to which he replies, by a long letter, remarkable only for its cobweb texture, and a deficiency of that courtesy and good nature he blames in the members of our constitution.

Is there not apparent, in your Correspondent's writing, a spark of that spirit which Protestants themselves blame in the first Reformers ? Luther enacted many things, according to his own assertion, solely to spite the Church of Rome ; hence, I suppose, the reiterated use of those epithets he knows are only used in derision and contempt ; hence, he assures us, the repetition of that part of a former letter which he finds gave offence : and let me here observe, the Catholics of Glasgow never withheld the acknowledgement and thanks to their brethren Protestants, for having suggested, and with them framed, an institution which has drawn forth the admiration of a sister kingdom, and the patronage of one of our Monarch's sons. No, Sir, it was the concluding part that should never have been penned or printed, and which truth itself could not palliate. He denies Catholics even the appellation of Catholic ; because, he says, the name is arrogantly assumed. I again refer to our House of Parliament, where some enlightened Protestants, in a debate connected with the Catholic question, objected to the word Catholic being used exclusively to denote the Church of Rome ; they did not substitute Papist or Papists, they knew it was an odious expression, and

that mockery blunts the edge of serious reasoning ; they used the term Roman Catholic.

The principles of the Catholic Church do not emanate from a Pope, but from the great Founder of the Christian faith, and if a Pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed, and the followers of the Ex-Pope would then, and only then, be called Papists. Before I conclude, let me beg of those who are not tainted with the venom of prejudice, not to receive as truths those allegations ungenerously charged on Catholics, because they remain unanswered. There are, in every Christian, some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion on them, with those whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would to me appear a sinful provocation.

Had your Correspondent taxed the Catholics with any one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it ; but he proceeds in the same unheeded course, and deals out misrepresentations with an unsparing hand. He asserts the Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible. They believe him to be the head of the church ; but they know him to be a man, and not their God, as he contemptuously asserts. But, if by such absurd sophistry he means to prove his first assertion, I must acknowledge they are fit pillars to support the unholy edifice he has raised with his own hand, at the expense of his neighbour's nicest feelings, his own integrity as a writer, and his charity as a Christian.

My pursuits and my absence will prevent me troubling you for some time ; and, as I hope your Correspondent will be silent when I return, I hope I shall not be tempted to take up my pen again, which, if it were to raise one angry frown from me, would be my greatest regret.

Yours, &c.

PAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

I KNOW that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or at most from the pains of purgatory ; but this is disproved by the Catechism, of which I quoted so largely in my last letter. We are there told, that the Church, as a good mother, when she grants indulgences, " gives nothing to her children

but what serves to relieve them in this world, and in the next." Indulgences, therefore, serve to relieve Papists from the punishment which their sins deserve in the world to come. To this, let me add the declaration of the divine, angelic, and seraphic doctor, St. Thomas, a pillar of the Popish Church. "There actually exists," says he, "an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, beyond what is necessary for their own salvation, and which are therefore applicable to the benefit of others; the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman Pontiff, and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." Here then is a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve, whether in this world or the next. It is not said to those who can afford to pay for it; but the practice of the Romish Church showed that they knew how to supply the ellipsis. The merits of Christ are out of the question here. Nothing is necessary but the merits of fellow-creatures, who it seems had done more good works than were necessary for their own salvation, while the man who takes his religion from the Bible knows, that though all the good works of all the men in the world, since the fall of Adam, were put into one common stock, they would not be sufficient to merit one breath of air.

It was the practice of the Romish Church to enjoin certain penances for certain transgressions. By and by they began to relax in the severity of their discipline. Dupin, a Popish historian, writing of the 12th century, says, "The practice of public penance for public sins was not yet entirely abolished, but it was become very rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained by other ways, and chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages. They began to reserve the remission of certain sins to the Pope and the Bishops." So far as appears, nobody then doubted that it was in the power of the Church, and of the Pope as her head, to allow certain sins to be committed, without subjecting the individual to the usual penances; and, when the permission was signified in writing, the document alone, or the fact and the document taken together, constitute what, in the primary sense of the term, was called an indulgence. But the matter did not remain long in this situation. An additional import was given to the word; the practice was extended; and the remission of penances prepared the way for the remission of sins. If the individual was freed from all penitentiary inflictions in the former case, in the latter he was freed from all punishment whatever; and if the indulgence was plenary, he might transgress with im-

punish every statute of the decalogue, and every ordinance of the Church. To this favoured individual, purgatory, and even hell itself, were divested of their terrors; in the prospect of the last judgment, he was already acquitted. *Edin. Ency. Vol. VIII. p. 316.*

On this subject, Dupin speaks with great tenderness. He had mentioned the origin of indulgences in the 12th century; and, when writing of the 15th century, he informs us, in few words, that "indulgences granted by the Popes were more common than ever: they had become a kind of traffic." This is as much as could be expected from a Papist; but it shows that the wickedness of the holy Church had by this time risen to a great height. It will amuse your readers to see the nature of this traffic, and the prices which were paid for indulgence to commit certain sins. A book was published at Rome, entitled, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," in which the price of absolution for every vice that the Pope professed to pardon, was fixed. I will not pollute your pages by many extracts, but mention two or three things, to show your readers in what estimation Papists held the privilege of committing certain crimes, and how the crimes themselves were estimated:—For a layman murdering a layman, a sum equal to about 7s. 6d.; for him that killeth his father or mother, wife or sister, 10s. 6d.; for laying violent hands on a clergyman, so it be not to the effusion of blood, 10s. 6d. Thus, it seems, to strike a clergyman, though it did not break his skin, was as great a crime as killing one's own parents. For a priest to marry, was a crime for which no sum could atone, at least I find nothing for this in the list; but for a priest to keep a concubine, was only 10s. 6d. For licence to eat flesh in Lent, 10s. 6d.; for a queen to adopt a child, L.300. This book has been often printed, both in Popish and Protestant countries; and the Protestant princes inserted it among the causes of their rejecting the Council of Trent. When Papists saw what use the Protestants made of it, they put it into the list of prohibited books, upon the pretence of its having been corrupted by the Protestants; but the many editions of it which have been published in Popish countries, and which the Papists themselves could not, and did not disown, (though perhaps they will disown it now,) were more than sufficient to justify the reproaches of Protestants, and to cover Rome with confusion, if she were capable of it. It was printed at Rome, 1514; at Cologne, 1515; at Paris, 1520, 1545, and 1625. See *Free Thoughts on the Toleration of Popery, by Calvinus Minor*, (the late Rev Archd. Bruce of Whitburn,) a book which contains a great mass of information on the subject of Popery, with the most ample

authorities. See also the *Morning Exercise against Popery*, with the authorities cited, quarto, page 489.

But the following authority alone, I should think enough. Claude D'Espence, a Parisian Divinc of great note in the Romish Church in the 16th century, bears the following testimony to this dreadful abuse :—" Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money ; so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a person can commit is to be poor. Shameful to relate ! they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying, that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, *The Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery*, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." *Claudius Espenceus Comment. ad cap. I. Epist. ad Titum, degress. II.*

For the existence of the famous Kilravack Bull, and that it is such a one as I represented, I am authorised to refer your Correspondents to the head of that house, Col. Rose of Kilravack, near Nairn, to the Rev. Mr. Cornack of Stow, near Edinburgh, and to Dr. Brewster of Edinburgh ; but why should modern Papists doubt of such a thing ? It is a mere trifle to some that might be mentioned. In the treasure of indulgences published by the Franciscans at Roan, 1614, were the following words :—" For every day until the nativity of our Lady, there are 862,000 years and 100 days of pardon and remission of the third part of sins granted." See *Free Thoughts*, &c. Some, however, went a great deal farther than this, and gave a full pardon of all sins, and a third part of sins besides. (*Ibid.*) I think the reverend author ought to have acquitted the Pope of this Bull : for it bears internal evidence of having been made in Ireland.

As Dupin informs us, it was only against the abuse of indulgences that Luther began to preach ;—" he did not yet directly attack the indulgences, nor the power of the Church, but maintained that the Pope could only forgive the penalties he imposed himself ; that, therefore, indulgences were only a relaxation of canonical punishments ; that they only regarded the living ; that those in purgatory could receive no benefit by them ; that at most they could only be useful by way of suffrages," &c. Such was

the erroneous opinion of Luther, when he had only begun to see the errors of Popery; and he was answered by the Pope himself as Dupin relates:—"When these things were doing in Germany, Pope Leo X. thinking by his decision to put a stop to the disputes that might arise against indulgences, set forth a Brief, on the 9th of Nov. 1515, by which he declared that the Successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, had power to forgive, by virtue of the keys, the guilt and punishment of actual sins, *viz.* the guilt by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment by the indulgences which he could grant to believers for just reasons, as well to those who were alive as to those who were in purgatory; and that those indulgences were founded upon the superabundance of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, of whose treasure the Pope is the dispenser, and this as well by form of absolution as by suffrage; that the dead and the living who truly obtain indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth." *Dupin, vol. IV. p. 17.* I allow that the language of this Brief is extremely equivocal; and I cannot help thinking it was made so of purpose, that it might mean any thing, or nothing, just as the Church or her clergy should please, in all time coming. One thing is, however, plainly asserted in it, that the Pope, by virtue of the keys, has power to forgive the guilt of actual sin by the sacrament of penance. Now, when the guilt is removed, what right has he to hold the punishment in his own hands; and to remit that only so far as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth; that is, I suppose, according to what has been paid for it?

After all the evidence that I have produced from the writings of Papists themselves, will PAX still maintain that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin? I expect he will; and he will get out by a quibble:—an indulgence is not the remission of sin,—it is merely the Letter or Bull that contains it! I do not see how AMICUS VERITATIS can get out so easily. He said, "with respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your Correspondent, that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and whatever he may say with regard to the ancient or modern meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions." There is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous,—he has been "contradicted." It has been proved that this Church, or her Head, granted permission to commit the grossest sins for half-a-guinea; and when was it known, that her constitutional organs, whether Popes

or Councils, expressed any abhorrence about the matter, or took any steps to put a stop to the evil?

With regard to Luther and the other Reformers, admitting it to be all true that A. V. asserts, I am not answerable for it. If I profess to believe in Luther; if I maintained that he was infallible in doctrine and practice, then, no doubt, I should reckon myself bound to defend all his doctrines and all his doings. But I know Luther was a fallible man like myself; and his authority goes no farther with me than that of the Pope. I respect, indeed, the truths which he was honoured to maintain against the Church of Rome; and I respect the memory of the man who, with so much intrepidity, maintained them: but I respect them not as his truths, but as the truths of the Bible.

A man who had just emerged from the thick darkness of Popery, was like one brought out of a dungeon into the light of day. He could not for a time see objects distinctly. This was precisely the case of Luther. Accordingly, as might have been expected, he made many mistakes. His consubstantiation, for instance, was little better than the Pope's transubstantiation. He had been so long accustomed to the quibbling casuistry of the schoolmen, that his perceptions of right and wrong, with regard to some points, may have been very indistinct. A good deal of the filth of Rome, no doubt, adhered to him after he came out of it; as would probably have been the case with any other man in similar circumstances.

With regard to the indulgence said to have been granted by him and his brethren, allowing the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at one time, the fact has been denied on grounds which appeared satisfactory to some credible historians; and Papists of the 17th century were as capable of forging a Bull as any person about Kilravack. It was at one time confidently affirmed, and circulated as a fact through great part of Christendom, that the devil had run away with Luther, soul and body. This would probably have been believed by all good Papists to this day, had not Luther, *in propria persona*, contradicted the fact. The most monstrous calumnies were circulated against Luther throughout all Europe, just as against John Knox in Scotland; and Bossuet, being an enemy of the German Reformer, would gladly catch at any thing that would go down with his readers; and put it into his book, with all its aggravations. Let A. V. bring from Protestant writers as much that is disgraceful to Luther and the Reformation, as I have brought from Popish writers, and Popish Bulls, to the disgrace of Popery, and he will have done something.

But suppose I admit (which I am rather inclined to do) that the whole is true as Bossuet had stated, and A. V. has quoted it,

what then? Why, it goes to prove what I have maintained in this and my last Letter. The Landgrave of Hesse would not have applied for an indulgence or dispensation to keep two wives, unless he had known that the Church was in the practice of granting such indulgence. Such princes as he is represented to be, looked upon the Reformation as an opposition shop set up for spiritual traffic. They had long dealt with Rome, but her wares had become rather too common and unfashionable for princes, since she had begun to sell indulgences so low as two-pence a piece, as was done by Tetzel. The Landgrave, therefore, wished to deal with this new comer; and when he applied for this indulgence, it is likely he would inform Luther and his friends, that if they did not grant what he wanted, he knew where to get it; and the Reformers, fearful of losing such a protector, while surrounded by powerful enemies, yielded to the temptation, and did what was unworthy of their cause. More of this in my next.

I am glad to see by your Paper of yesterday, that PAX has taken his word, and written something in reply to my Letter of the 12th instant. I am glad of this, not because I have pleasure in tormenting him; but because he has divulged some more of the errors of his system, which I will attempt to expose when I am at leisure. In the mean time, I shall proceed right forward in the route I have prescribed to myself, in answering his former Letter, and that of AMICUS VERITATIS.

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

June 19th, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

WHEN I first addressed you, it was far from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth. With the same intention I again address you, and endeavour to reply to your Correspondent, "A PROTESTANT."

Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience;" from which I would infer, that during our controversy, your Correspondent has greatly the advantage, and more parti-

cularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally insure him of being received with approbation. :

In the commencement of his last Letter, your Correspondent says, "if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin." Now, Sir, I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic Chapel was asked for a charitable purpose? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion? Consequently the Chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement.

As your Correspondent has taken up the subject of indulgences, I shall endeavour to follow him through the most of his course, and to make good my former assertion, "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" but if, in replying to your Correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute: and that

"The blood will follow where the knife is driven—

"The flesh will quiver where the incense tear."

Before I proceed to quote the authority of the Douay Catechism, respecting the word Indulgence, I shall just remark that this is a work which is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church; and which is put into the hands of every child that is learning its Christian doctrine. In the 71st page of the said Catechism is asked, "Question, What is an indulgence? Answer, Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church; but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance." Now, Sir, I would ask any honest impartial man, possessed of Christian candour, could he infer from this answer that an indulgence is a "permission to commit sin?" No, Sir, the idea is absurd, and I am astonished that your Correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done. But, Sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the approved doctrine of the Catholic Church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection that Catholics abjure as antichristian those principles imputed to them by your Correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the Pope is infallible. That I may be found correct, I shall refer to Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. This is a document

which is approved by the Pope and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received and accredited by the British Government, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand; and now again boldly repeat, "that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." With what a face of effrontery can your Correspondent come forward and declare to the public that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them?

I shall next ask your Correspondent, Did not the Protestant Church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall to his recollection the notorious *Cutty Stool*, whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might, and often was exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?

In your Correspondent's last letter I noticed an allusion to a Rev. Gentleman which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *Gospel* should be a minister of *Peace*; and it was unfair to suppose, that because the Rev. Gentleman here alluded to, did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your Correspondent cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures. The Council of Trent, and the Church, merely command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which is approved by the Church; and, consequently, cannot be said to forbid the reading of the Scriptures, any more than the Bible Society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist.

It would be almost endless, Mr. Editor, to answer all the charges which your Correspondent may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against Popery. I shall, however, in my next, animadvert a little upon any thing worthy of notice, especially those proofs which he has brought forward to substantiate his former assertions. I suppose your Correspondent was not aware that the doctrines of Tetzel were condemned by the Pope's Nuncio.

Meantime, I am, Sir, yours, &c

AMICUS VERITATIS

20th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

I FIND that some of my late Letters were too long to admit of immediate insertion in your Papers; and I have been told they were too long to command the attention of superficial and coffee-room readers. Henceforth, therefore, I shall deal out what I have to say in smaller portions.

In my last, I said I was inclined to admit the truth of the statement of *AMICUS VERITATIS* respecting the indulgence granted by Luther and his colleagues to the Landgrave of Hesse. Instead of justifying, I am as ready to condemn their conduct in this matter as he can be. But it is worthy of remark, that this is only a single and solitary instance, set in opposition to thousands which might be shown to have been granted by the Pope and Popish Bishops. The very eagerness with which such an instance is seized, the triumph with which it is brought forward by the advocates of the Papacy, and the surprise which it excites in the breasts of Protestants, who have not previously known of it, is perhaps the best answer to any objection to the Reformation which might be made on this ground. It shows, that in the opinion of both foes and friends, such facts are rare exceptions to the manner in which the cause of the Reformation was carried on, and altogether unlike the conduct of the Reformers. What Luther and his colleagues did on this occasion, was only to express their opinion or judgment as to the lawfulness of a particular proposed measure. Highly improper and condemnable as this opinion was, there is a wide difference between it and a power claimed and arrogated by an individual, or class, to set men free from what they allowed to be sinful, and contrary to the law of God—a claim which had been set up and exerted in innumerable instances, to gratify the ambition and avarice of priests, at the expense of all moral obligations. You will observe I am not defending the Reformers, for I think in this matter their conduct was quite indefensible; but, for the information of your readers, I shall cite a high example, which, if the Reformers had yet any regard for the authority of the Pope, which some of them had after they had declared for the Reformation, was calculated to lead them astray. Pope Clement VIII. had, only a few years before the affair of the Landgrave of Hesse happened, offered to grant permission to Henry VIII. of England to have two wives, although he was restrained by fear of the Emperor from divorcing his sister. This is stated in a letter, dated 18th Sept. 1530, from

Gregory Cassalis, Henry's agent at the Court of Rome; which letter is published from the original by Lord Herbert, in his History of the Life and Reign of Henry VIII. p. 330. The following is an extract and translation:—"Superioribus diebus, Pontifex, secreto, veluti rem quam magni faceret, mihi proposuit conditionem hujusmodi, concedi posse vestræ Majestati ut duas uxores habeas;" that is, "His Holiness, a few days ago, secretly (because he considered the affair to be one of very high importance) submitted to me the following accommodation, viz. that an indulgence may be granted to your Majesty to have two wives." Here is the Pope not only claiming the power of granting indulgence to commit sin, but actually suggesting a wicked project to the King of England, who needed no prompter to acts of wickedness. In his first Letter, AMICUS VERITATIS asserted,—“If it were the case that Popish Bishops could have granted indulgence to commit sin, Henry VIII. would never have professed himself a Protestant.” I now appeal to A. V. himself, whether such a proposal made by the most holy Head of the infallible Church, was not enough to make every honest man forsake Rome, whether he became Protestant or not?

With respect to the first indulgence which A. V. ascribes to Luther, viz. “a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances,” I am not disposed to admit the truth of it without farther evidence. He says, “that it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your Correspondent to 119 and 123 pages, 5th vol. of the Works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg.” Now, I ask A. V. whether he has actually seen and read any thing in the works of Luther, that, by fair construction, can bear the above meaning? I ask this because I am sceptical on that point. In plain English, I do not believe that Luther gave it as his deliberate opinion that it was lawful to commit the sin mentioned in certain circumstances, or that he gave a perpetual indulgence to any one for that purpose. I have no access to the book referred to; but if A. V. has it, I call upon him to leave it with you, for an hour or two, that I may consult the passage: or if he does not choose to do this, let him send me, through you, an extract authenticated by his own signature. I will not be satisfied with his translation, nor by any quotation, or extract, or translation from any other book. I must have the *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication; and if I do find that it contains what A. V. ascribes to it, I will publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. I suggest the mode of sending me this extract through you that he may not have to plead his determination not to answer my Letters; but if he

chooses to give the extract to the public in a Letter from himself, so much the better.

Dreadfully corrupt as the Church of Rome was about the time of the Reformation and long before it, there were some honest men in her communion, who saw and deplored her corruptions; and did not, like modern Papists, gloss them over, and by sheer impudence deny their existence. Such was Claude D'Espence, whom I quoted in my last. Such was also Wesselus, a man highly esteemed in the Church of Rome. He argues like a Protestant against indulgences; but his arguing proves clearly what I have been maintaining all along, that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of granting them. "No Pope," says he, "can grant indulgences even for an hour; and it is ridiculous to imagine that, for doing the same thing, an indulgence should be granted, sometimes for seven years, sometimes for 700 or 7000, and sometimes for ever, by a plenary indulgence. There is not the least foundation in Scripture for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment, upon which the doctrine of indulgence is grounded. Covetousness was the cause of their introduction at first; and though the Pope once swore to the French Ambassador that he did not know the corruption of the sellers of indulgences, yet, when he knew, he permitted them, and they became more extensive." See *M'Culloch's Popery Condemned*, p. 182.

In my next, I shall take up the subject of HERVEY and holy places.

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

SIR,

IN my Letter which appeared in your Paper of the 6th instant, I said, "Persons who believe that a priest can create his own Creator,—that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, may very easily believe that a bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants, I mean consistent and enlightened Protestants, believe neither the one nor the other." AMICUS VERITATIS replies, that I must not have been aware that many enlightened and consistent Protestants do not agree with me; and then he cites Mr. HERVEY, author of the *Meditations*, whose authority, he says, gives a zest to all he has advanced on this subject.

E

It is true, HERVEY does speak of parish churches in language sufficiently high and bombastic; but HERVEY is no higher authority with me than A. V. himself. In his youth he was far from being an enlightened, and, so long as he spoke of material buildings as sacred places, he was not a consistent, Protestant. "The Bible—the Bible alone—is the religion of Protestants." Whatever, therefore, a man may be in other respects, if there be any thing in his religion which is not derived from the Bible, he is not a consistent Protestant. Now, I maintain, that we have no authority from the Bible to regard one house or building more holy than another. It is needless to refer me to the tabernacle and the temple among the Jews; because these things had no relation to the New Testament state of the church, but as types or shadows of spiritual things which were afterwards to be enjoyed; and it was ordained that the shadows should pass away when the substance should have come, which took place when Christ had fulfilled all that was typified of him in the law of Moses by the sacrifice of himself. If, therefore, we take the tabernacle and the temple as examples for calling our places of worship holy, we must have all the furniture and all the services of the temple. We must have the symbols of the Divine Presence—we must have the altar of burnt-offering, and the altar of incense, and a high priest, and a numerous retinue of priests, killing cattle and offering sacrifices every day. Some of these things, indeed, the Church of Rome does exhibit, which is a proof, among many others that might be mentioned, that she sets her authority against that of God; for it is not more true that these things were divinely appointed for a time, than that they were divinely appointed to cease when Christ came to accomplish what was signified by them. Christ regarded the temple as a holy place, and he chastised those who profaned it; because it was not till his death that the system of Jewish worship was abolished. It is from his Apostles, and from the churches which they gathered, that we take our example.

Now, they do not appear to have regarded one place more holy than another, with the exception of some Jewish converts, perhaps, who could not all at once divest themselves of the veneration with which they had been accustomed to regard the place where their fathers worshipped. The Apostles preached in the temple, because it was the place of public resort, just as they preached any where else, when they could get people to hear them. We find them meeting in private houses, in a school-room, by the sea-side, and, what would be reckoned very indecorous now-a-days, preaching in the open street; but no hint of their regarding one place more holy than another. Be he who he will, therefore, who ascribes holiness to buildings, inherently or relatively, he is not a consistent Protestant.

But HERVEY, especially towards the end of his days was an enlightened Protestant. I am glad that A. V. has been reading his works; but let him not stop at the productions of his youth—let him peruse and study the works of his mature age, especially his *Theron and Aspasio*, and his defence of that work against the exceptions of John Wesley. There he will find the Papist doctrine of human merit cut up by the roots. Let him study these works, and recommend them to all his brethren.

AMICUS VERITATIS says, “your Correspondent might have been more sparing in his reproaches against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit; and for raising a building which for ages to come will adorn and ornament our city.” I have no objection that our city be ornamented with stately buildings by those who can afford to do it; but I would rather that all the houses in Glasgow were as plain as they were a hundred years ago, than that our poor population should be deprived of one necessary of life, in order to build palaces. I acquit myself of having reproached the Papists on this subject. I stated a plain fact, that while they were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the house of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance. If they feel themselves reproached by this, it is the fact that does it, not I.

But this is not all:—I ask A. V. if that house was not built in a great measure at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, a starving people? I ask him, if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the “piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow.” The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering; and will he accept as honourable to him that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front; and it will remain, for “ages to come,” a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.

Idolatry in every form is cruel. That Popery is idolatry, is clearly proved by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Lainshaw, in a late publication, which I strongly recommend to such of your readers as wish to know what that system really is. A. V. has discovered the spirit of idolatry in the Letter which I am at present answering. He says, “Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated?” Now, what must that God be, to whose majesty any material building can be a resemblance? Certainly not that God who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and whose glory fills the universe. It must be an idol of A. V.’s own fancy.

I see from your Paper of yesterday, that A. V. has also taken his word, and carved out more work for

A PROTESTANT

June 26th, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

IF frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. Your Correspondent seems to have adopted this principle; he conceives he may justly assume the privilege of saying what has been said by hundreds before him; and, therefore, without hesitation, condemns the practice of indulgences, in terms the most pointed and severe. But I am not to be intimidated by a sourness of aspect: the shafts of ridicule will not in the least discompose me, and I can despise the meanness of sophistical reasoning, whilst I pity the prostitution of talent.

In my last I endeavoured to prove "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" and I promised that, in my next, I would take some notice of those proofs which your Correspondent had advanced in opposition to this. I shall commence with his Letter of 18th of June. The first in rotation is a bull or indulgence, "which," he says, "was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the Pope, and which was so instrumental in helping forward the Reformation." The second was an indulgence, "which was granted by the present Pope to the good people of Cork." The third was an indulgence granted by Pope Urban the VIII. to the people of Ireland. And, lastly, he very gravely proceeds to quote the authority of a French catechism, which was translated and edited by a Protestant, a known enemy of the Catholic Church.

In the first place, Mr. Editor, I shall merely remark, that the doctrines or theses of Tetzel were publicly condemned by the Pope's nuncio, Miltitz, and consequently cannot be Catholic doctrine. Your Correspondent should have known this, and he really should make himself better acquainted with history, that he may not so palpably commit himself. An error of this nature is very inexcusable in a writer who addresses the public, especially when brought forward with an air of triumph, to affect the interest of those he imputes it to. He will find me correct respecting the condemnation of Tetzel's doctrines, by consulting Mosheim by Maclaine, Fleury's Continuation. Maimbourg, and the historians

of the period in general, who represent him to have died of chagrin, in consequence of his treatment. The second of his proofs requires hardly to be noticed. Indeed I do not recollect of ever seeing any thing so palpably misapplied; there is not a single word in it applicable to the subject in question, and yet, he asserts that it is an "indulgence to commit sin!" Really, Mr. Editor, it is amusing to see the puny efforts of bigotry and credulity; when a person is determined to withstand the truth, they evince themselves on almost every occasion. "Truth is one: it is the centre of the circle: recede from it, and you may wander to any point of the circumference." Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII. the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion. A period when the sword of persecution was unsheathed from its scabbard—when the flames of intolerance raged with destructive violence—when the storms of passion, like a hurricane upon the deep, overwhelmed the miserable victims of their fury—when the demon of falsehood spread her malignant influence over the hearts and sensibilities of men, and prompted them to invent the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren. Who would take a review, from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequences of accumulated forgeries? It was this detestable habit of fabrication and lies, in your chief reformers, which drew from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, a Protestant divine, the following remarkable confession:—"Forgery," says he, "appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism; originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed, by the intercourses of vice, to the profligate head of the Church of England."—*Whitaker, vol. III. p. 49.* I am not astonished that Bogue's Catechism was the one which your Correspondent has selected for his purposes. This is a work which was translated from the original French, by a Protestant, merely for the purpose of exercising his talent of ridicule, and it was natural to suppose that your Correspondent would apply to such a valuable source of misrepresentation. But it is rather unfortunate for him, however, that, of the 41 lines he has quoted, there is not a single passage which says that an indulgence "is a permission to commit sin." Not one; yet he proceeds, and asserts that from this document he is enabled to maintain, "not only that the Pope, and the Church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin; but that they actually command it." Judge, O Public! on what this defamer of his neighbour's character grounds his very heavy charge. On the answer to the fourth question quoted, "the mind of the Church is to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on

their part, divine justice." Is there any sensible person who could draw such an inference from the answer I have above quoted? None, I expect. Yet your Correspondent, by a manner of reasoning almost peculiar to himself, endeavours to establish his charge. Like Luther before him, with one dash of his pen, he magnanimously abolishes the obligation of good works, and opens the gates of heaven to every man who can only boast the gift of an all-saving faith. This Solidifian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the Church of England, in her articles, is "a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men:

" 'Tis prudence to reform her into ease,
And put her in undress, to make her please:
A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
And leave the luggage of *good works* behind."

"On this head," says a writer of the present day, "we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness straight and rugged; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catherine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ it was still so uninviting, that, as he declared, few would choose to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of the Scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of the Catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider as an invaluable legacy."

In my next, I shall take up your Correspondent's Letter of 23d inst. I shall produce my quotations from Luther in their proper place.

Meantime, I am, Sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

GLASGOW, 25th June. 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,

PAX undertook to make me feel, if possible, the injustice of my uncharitable remark at the conclusion of my Letter, which appeared in your Paper of the 6th of June. I was replying to that

part of A. V.'s Letter, which spoke of the darkness passing away, and giving place to the chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy; and my remark was, that I supposed the time of this darkness was that which had elapsed since the Reformation: and that the light which was now about to arise was that of the dark ages. Now, where is the injustice and uncharitableness of this? Is it not the opinion of all good Papists that the Reformation was the darkest and most melancholy dispensation the Church ever experienced? Is it not the custom of preachers in Popish churches, especially in that in Glasgow, to declaim against the Reformation, and against Luther, and all others who had a hand in that great schism? Is it not the desire and prayer of every member of the Romish Church, that things were restored to the state in which they were before Luther was born? Is it not most desirable that the Pope and his army of priests had, as formerly, the key of every man's heart and conscience throughout almost all Europe? Would it not be a happy thing if the Church had still the power of settling all controversies, and silencing all objectors to her infallibility, by sending them to the stake or the gibbet? I ask Mr. PAX, if he would not rejoice if all these things were to happen? In short, if he would not rejoice if our light were that of the dark ages? And well he might: he would then be a luminary of the first magnitude, for a little light goes a great way in the dark.

To show that these surmises are not uncharitable, I refer PAX to an enlightened historian of his own communion. Dupin speaks with great complacency of the state of things in the tenth century, which, for its darkness and the sottish ignorance of both priests and people, has been called the age of lead. "In this century," says he, "there was no controversy relating to the doctrine of faith, or points of divinity, because there were no heretics, or persons who refined upon matters of religion, and dived into our mysteries. However, there were some clergymen in England, who would needs maintain that the bread and wine upon the altar continued in the same nature after the consecration, and that they were only the figure of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. This error was refuted by a miracle wrought by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, who made the body of Jesus Christ appear visibly in the celebration of the holy mysteries, and made some drops of blood flow out of the consecrated bread when it was broken. St. Dunstan likewise refuted that error very strenuously in his discourses.—In fine, there was no council held in this century that disputed any point of doctrine or discipline; which shows us that there was no error of faith that was of any consequence, or made any noise in the Church."—*Dupin, cent. X.* Happy state of the Church, when her Bishops could refute error by a miracle! and when nobody was troubled with common sense, but some clergy men in that perverse country, England.

PAX accuses me of trying, by reproaches, "to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug." And he prophesies, that in "a little it will be found rotted to the hilt." What sword does he mean? If it be the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, I hope it will never be sheathed, that it will never rot, and that it will never cease to be wielded by the friends of truth, so long as error exists in the world. If he mean the sword of persecution, and that I try to unsheath it, he slanders his neighbour, and lays himself open to more severe reproof than I choose to administer. I have no hostility against him; I pity him as the unhappy victim of error and imposition; and the worst thing I wish him is, that he would be convinced of his errors, and renounce them. But I declare the most determined hostility against the whole system of Popery; not against Papists, but against their errors, which are their own greatest enemies. Like Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Lainshaw, to whose work on this subject I referred in my last, I believe it is not in the power of the devil to invent such another system of delusion, and wickedness, and opposition to the religion of Christ. This was the mightiest effort of the wicked one to deprive the world of the benefit of Christ's incarnation and death, and to keep the human race in bondage to himself. He has been deplorably successful; and the ruin of millions of souls, has been the consequence. It is because I wish well to the persons of Papists—it is because I wish nothing less than their present and everlasting happiness, that I wish them delivered from the bondage of error, and the dominion of their priests—and that the priests themselves were delivered from the slavery of the prince of darkness.

But persecution is not the way to accomplish this. If there be one thing in Popery which I abhor more than another, it is its persecuting spirit. It has always persecuted when it had the power. It made it a meritorious act to extirpate heretics. Most of the reformed churches brought a portion of this spirit from Rome with them; and it is one of the last rags of Popery which some of them are inclined to throw away. I consider every species of civil disability and disqualification, on a religious account, persecution; and I am sorry that, in this otherwise free and happy country, so many are subjected to it, and Papists among the rest.* Persecution is disgraceful to those who inflict, but honourable to those

* I think it right to let this remain as originally written, and printed in all the former editions, though I found it my duty, in a subsequent part of my work, to qualify the opinion here expressed. I am now convinced that the exclusion of papists from political power in our protestant state is not persecution, but a necessary measure of self-defence; not, however, on account of the errors of their faith, but because of their subjection to the Pope of Rome,—a power hostile to every protestant government.

who suffer it. It throws around them the charm and glory of a relationship to apostles and prophets, and men of whom the world was not worthy. Popery is not worthy of such honour. I would never persecute Papists.

Nobody can hinder them from continuing Papists if they please and, even in this case, I wish to do them good. I wish to see them all well educated, and respectable members of society. I have, therefore, been a subscriber to their schools, and intend to remain so. Whatever creed they shall profess, it is better to have a reading, well-informed, than an ignorant population.

A PROTESTANT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—IN “A PROTESTANT’S” Letter of the 23d June, he exultingly exclaims, “I do not see how AMICUS VERITATIS can get out so easily.” He then quotes my assertion, which I dwelt upon in my Letter of 25th, and continues, “there is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous: he has been contradicted.” It does not however follow, Mr Editor, that because a man has been contradicted, he must necessarily be in error. The apostle Paul was often contradicted, but that was no proof he was in error; and, notwithstanding all the precaution and penetration of my opponent, strange to relate, he has himself opened the door to me, and proved that I was not in error. In the commencement of his Letter, he says, “I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory.” Now, surely, Sir, what Catholics maintain constitutes their tenets; and it does not require an uncommon degree of reasoning to understand, that if it be the belief of Catholics that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from temporal punishment, they cannot mean, at the same time, a permission or liberty to commit sin. Here the candid reader will acknowledge that your Correspondent has only contradicted himself, and not convicted me of error. But he says, that this is disproved by the Catechism, of which he quoted so largely: however, he should have been candid enough to have explained that a Protestant, a professed enemy of the Catholic Church, was the editor of that Catechism. Then every unprejudiced person would have acknowledged that the information which he imparted was devoid of one essential means of real information, *viz.* impartiality and fidelity of translation. I must acknowledge, however, that David Bogue is much more candid than your Correspondent, for he defines in the publication from which your Correspondent quotes so largely, (and on which he reasons so justly as to condemn the laws of every church and of every civil government on earth), that the virtue

of indulgences in the Catholic Church "only consists in mitigating the rigour of the temporal punishment due to sin." This is not surely a liberty to commit sin, any more than it is a liberty to commit sin to commute the punishment of the Cutty Stool for a fine of a few shillings or a few pounds.

Even allowing the quotation from St Thomas to be correct (which I deny), there is not one word in it which so much as hints at a liberty to commit sin, which is what your Correspondent endeavours to establish. Even he himself acknowledges that it would mean only "a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve." Now, surely, your Correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred Scriptures, promises to give to the truly penitent, a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means at the same time to grant him permission or an indulgence to commit sin. The quotations from Dupin are of the same stamp: not one word is said of a liberty to commit sin: they are entirely confined to public penances.

Your Correspondent proceeds to quote the Edinburgh Encyclopedia: as well might he quote to me his own authority. The quotations from the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, as well as that which he produces in his next paragraph, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," are downright forgeries. I do not, however, assert that the individuals to whom he refers were the forgers; I only mean to say that they copied the forgeries from other books, in which they might have been circulated as real facts. Your Correspondent himself acknowledges that the publication to which he alludes is among the number of prohibited books; and as no book is prohibited, but such as contain doctrine contrary to the tenets of the Catholic faith, he thereby acknowledges that what he wishes his readers to believe Catholic doctrine, is, on the contrary, condemned by all the authority of the Catholic Church. To such gross and palpable forgeries, a denial is all that can be expected: and though he asserts that the book entitled "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," was printed at Rome, 1518, at Paris, 1520, &c. it is quite a mistake. Every person knows that it was very easy to date a book at Rome, though printed at Wirtemberg, Amsterdam, or London. If opportunity will permit, however, I intend to enter more fully upon this subject hereafter. When he refers to "Free Thoughts," &c. he refers to antiquated calumnies, to enemies of the Catholic Church, as a proof of her tenets; and it would be just as candid to refer to the French *Moniteur*, when under the thralldom of Bonaparte, for the character of the British government.

In treating of Protestant indulgences, which he is unable to justify, your Correspondent seems to think that Catholics were as capable of forging calumnies on their Protestant brethren, as some

Protestants were ready enough to forge against them. He surely will not refuse to submit to the decision of a very learned Protestant writer, I mean the Rev. Mr Whitaker. "Forgery," says he, "I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it, seems to have been peculiar to the reformed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery." *Whitaker, vol. III. p. 2.*

In his Letter of the 25th ult. your Correspondent appears "sceptical" with regard to the existence of an indulgence which I formerly said was to be found in Luther's Works. He requests me to give him the quotations. But before I do this, I may express my surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquainted with them, but ignorant of the great father of his own. That Luther did preach the doctrines in question, is certain. He tells us, that whilst he continued a Catholic monk, he "observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gave himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer;" whereas, after he became reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence: to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious woman, who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above; and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters, pp. 158, 159.* The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are:—"Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut femina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas—Tertia ratio divortii est, ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit—hic opportunum est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera volet: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla." *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt. tom. V. fol. 119, 120.* The Works of Luther are preserved in the Library of the University of Glasgow, where your Correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect that he will be as good as his word.

Your Correspondent says that those indulgences of Luther which I adduced were solitary cases, I now ask him in short words:—Did not Luther issue more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V.? Did not Calvin and Beza require the Huguenots to rebel against their sovereigns? Did not Knox, and the Presbyterian Clergy of Scotland in general, with thundering anathemas impel their followers to shake off the dominion of the Queen Regent, and afterwards that of the unfortunate Mary? What else were the sermons and writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poyntet, and other fathers of the new

religion at home, in the reign of Queen Mary, but so many decrees in favour of rebellion, and so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance? Did not a new set of Protestant doctors, proceeding, however, upon the fundamental principle of the former, that of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and in all matters of religion, preach up, on the alleged authority of God's word, the justice and necessity of deposing and murdering their king, the gallant Charles I., and subverting the constitution? Did not the same doctors, on the same pretended sacred authority, absolve the prisoners of war who were released to them at Brentford, from the oaths they had severally taken of not serving again in the republican army? Did not the most famous prelates and divines of the establishment, a few years before, pretend to absolve the king himself from his sworn duty to his subjects, and the very law of nature, by deciding that he was at liberty to send his favourite minister, Strafford, to the scaffold, notwithstanding he himself was conscientiously persuaded of the Earl's innocence? He will not now have to complain that I depend upon one or two solitary cases: let him answer these, and I can furnish him with more.

Now, Sir, after all which has been disproved, will your Correspondent again come forward and endeavour to enforce his odious calumnies? Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry? O how shameful and obstinate a thing is bigotry! "To what end," says Mr Philips, "is argument with the bigot? No philosopher can contrive—no humanity can melt—no miracles can convert—no religion can reclaim him. In his hands the gospel is a murderer, and God a demon. He has no pity, for he cannot feel; he has no piety, for he cannot forgive; his prayers are curses—his communion death—his vengeance is eternity. Red with the fires of hell—reeking with massacres of earth—and righteous with the blasphemies of heaven, he erects his cannibal divinity upon a throne of skulls: and true to the primeval archetype, feeds even with a brother's blood the impious flame of his rejected altar."

When your Correspondent remains silent, I intend, if time and opportunity will permit, to reply to the challenge which he made in his Letter of 23d ult. but, in the mean time, shall proceed to take notice of his Letter, dated 24th June, &c.

I am Sir, Yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

GLASGOW, 3d July, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE

SIR,—AMICUS VERITATIS has "often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that in Great Britain, Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understand-

ing their own belief." If ever they possessed this faculty, I should like to know who has deprived them of it. I believe, however, few of them ever possessed it; and I question if A. V. himself does so. Does he understand transubstantiation, or does he not believe in it? Does he understand how the real body of Christ can be in a thousand places at the same time, and eaten whole by thousands of individuals, perhaps a thousand times in their lives? If he does possess the faculty of understanding this, he is a greater man than I took him for.

But I suppose he means that we do not allow Papists to know what their belief is. "Of the myriads of declaimers against Popery," says he "with which this kingdom abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the right reverend divine who instructs his brethren the clergy of his diocese, there is not one who does not appear to claim more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves." Now there appears to me nothing wonderful in this. If the Papists, like other sects, professed to think for themselves, and to believe what was the result of their own investigation and reflection, it would be unjust to charge them with any thing but what they professed at the time. If any man, or any class of men, tell us plainly what their faith is, we ought to give them credit for what they profess, and no more. But if any man tell me that he belongs to a church whose authorized standard of faith is before the world, and whose practice is well known to the world; that he adheres to that standard, and approves that practice, then I am not bound to take his word for the faith or practice of his church. I judge from her standard and general practice; and if his private judgment be different, I tell him he is a dissenter, he has forsaken the faith of his church. The faith of the church of Scotland, for instance, is as well defined in her standards as perhaps any thing of the kind can be; her practice also is known to the world; and it is very possible that an Episcopalian, or an Independent, may know what is the faith and practice of Scottish Presbyterians, better than many of the very Presbyterians do themselves.

Papists do not profess to exercise their own judgment in matters of faith, or to believe any thing different from what their Church believes; and as this Church is infallible either in her body, or arms, or head, it is not certain which; as she believes now what she always did, and ever will believe, I am not obliged to take the report of her faith from any modern Papist, who may feel himself ashamed of some of the frailties of his old mother, and wish to conceal or deny them. I go to their authentic records. I appeal to their own historians, their own divines, whom they hold in great veneration, their own Popes, who are generally by Papists believed infallible. From these sources, and from the allowed practices of the Church, any man is capable of acquiring as "accurate knowledge

of the Catholic doctrine as the very Catholics themselves." Nay, I could bring young females from the nursery, not "unlettered" ones, indeed, who really have more accurate knowledge of this subject, than perhaps nine-tenths of the Papists in Glasgow. I do not say they know more than A. V.; for I believe he knows more than he chooses to make known.

Let the Papists in Scotland, in the present day, come honestly forward, and tell us what is their own belief, without respect to any other authority. Let them confess that the Church of Rome had become very corrupt both in doctrine and practice, as is perfectly evident from all authentic history; but that they are not answerable for such corruption; that they renounce all that is really corrupt in the system, and are determined to think and act for themselves according to what they find in the Bible;—let them do this, and then we will not judge of them by what we find clearly established against the Church of Rome, but according to their own professions, and their own practice. Then we will not call them Papists, or even Roman Catholics; but give them any name which they may choose for themselves as dissenters from the Church of Rome. If, however, they will cling to Rome as their dear and only mother; if they will maintain that this is the only true Church; that she never was, and never can be wrong:—then we are entitled to draw the veil from the bloated face of the mother of harlots, to show her to the world as she is; and those who maintain that she is innocent, and holy, and infallible, have no right to complain, if we accuse them of consenting to all her abominations.

Every word of this applies to A. V., and PAX, and their fellow Papists. They find themselves in a situation in which it is impossible to maintain and practise Popery in all the grossness of it. The atmosphere in which they move is too bright for their works of darkness. They cannot prescribe to their penitents a certain number of stripes on the bare back as an atonement for their sins. They cannot set their fine ladies, or even their poor old women, to walk nine times a day round the Chapel in Clyde Street, over the hard stones upon their bare knees, in order to procure the release of some soul from purgatory. They cannot send their secret agents in the dead hour of night to snatch away from his family some person whom they suspect of heresy, to be cast into a dungeon, never to be heard of more;—though some lines quoted by A. V. in his letter of the 25th June, about the knife driving, the blood flowing, the pincers tearing, and the flesh quivering, make me more than suspect that he was thinking of the Inquisition, and wishing that he had me in it. I say they cannot do these things in Scotland. They are obliged therefore to assume the appearance of humanity, and moderation, and common sense; but while they maintain that they are of the Church of Rome, and that this Church is the same that ever it was, we do them no

injustice when we say that they would be what Papists formerly were, if they had the power.

Some people have an idea that the Popery of the present age is not so bad as the Popery of a former age ; and this is reckoned a charitable and liberal view of the matter ; but Papists themselves do not receive this as a concession in their favour, or thank those who make it. They will not admit that their religion has changed in any point whatever. They would gladly have us believe that it was always as harmless as it now appears in Glasgow ; and for this purpose they deny that ever it was what all history represents it to have been. They deny facts as clearly established, even by their own historians, as any fact of history can be ; and with the most unblushing effrontery affect to wonder that we will not take their word in opposition to all other evidence. Besides the history of past ages, we know from the present state of Popery in those countries where it reigns in all its glory, that the human mind is enslaved as much by it as ever. The Pope is still looked up to as their God upon earth. His authority is supreme in matters of religion and morality. As if the law of God were not sufficiently strict ; as if men were not wicked enough by the violation of its precepts, he can actually create sins and then forgive them ; he makes that sinful which was not so, and then he can grant pardon for money. He can grant indulgence, for instance, to marry within the forbidden degrees ; and it is difficult to say what he cannot do. He has prohibited the formation of societies for circulating the Bible. He has restored the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits ; and has, in short, done every thing in his power to bring Europe again under subjection to his dark dominion. I ask AMICUS VERITAS, if his religion be not the very same that prevails in Spain, Portugal, and Italy ? If any person in any of these countries were to write or speak as freely against Popery as he does against Luther and the Reformation, would it not be at the risk of his life ? His is the same religion that opposes heresy by force : he must approve of this, because such is the will of the holy church which cannot err, and though he cannot oppose error here by torture and the Inquisition, it is not unfair to presume that he would do so if he could. His system at least leads to this : and if his own humanity would not suffer him to do such a thing, it must be because he is not so bad as his religion.

A. V. says further, that " objections which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward," &c. I challenge him to show that any one of the objections which I have brought forward has ever been once refuted. It certainly " is in vain that Catholics disclaim the odious tenets which have been imputed to them ; in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils." All this certainly is in vain, while they avowedly adhere to a system, the iniquity of which is known to all the world.

I hope PAX is come home by this time, as I intend a little more plain dealing with him; after which I shall attend to A. V. who, in two letters, has laid himself open to such an exposure as he will not like. I am glad, however, that he is writing; because it leads him to divulge what his own sentiments are on the subjects of religion. He has plainly avowed some of the grossest errors of Popery: and it makes the work much easier to me, when I get this directly from himself, than to be obliged to seek for it in the Bulls of Popes, and the Canons of Councils. I am, &c.

July 2d, 1818.

A PROTESTANT.

TO THE READERS OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

As the controversy between me and the advocates of Popery is likely to take a more extensive range than was at first contemplated: and as it is not likely that the Editor of a public Newspaper will be able to afford room for all that will be written on the subject, consistently with due attention to other matter, I have resolved to give my sentiments to the public in another form. While I express my thanks to the Editor, for his ready admission of free discussion on this, as on every other subject, which would not likely have been done by any other in the city, I have often had occasion to regret that he could not print fast enough, and that my Letters sometimes lay in his hands a whole week before they were given to the public.

I had a Letter prepared for the Chronicle of this day, containing a variety of matter on the subject of indulgences, with extracts and animadversions on the Douay Catechism, which some unknown friend was so kind as to send me through the Chronicle Office: but as the Editor must delay printing it, and as, from the pressure of other matter, I can never be certain when I shall come before the public in a newspaper, which must be open to all the world as well as to me, I have resolved to publish what I have to say farther upon the subject, in the form of weekly numbers under the title of "THE PROTESTANT."

I have also to express my thanks to some unknown Correspondents, who have written me very friendly and complimentary Letters. One of them, who subscribes himself *Pillsem*, offers to substantiate a fact, with regard to indulgences granted in Scotland in the present day; but, before I can make public use of his communication, it is necessary that he favour me with his name and address, with liberty to refer to him in case the fact be contradicted.

The first Number of THE PROTESTANT, containing the Letter intended for the Glasgow Chronicle of this day, will be published on Saturday first, and may be had of all the Booksellers. The price will not be more than to cover the expense; and it is particularly recommended to the attention of Papists.

July 14th, 1818.

A PROTESTANT.

Advertisement which appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

IF answers have not appeared to all the Letters published in the GLASGOW CHRONICLE, under the signature of "A PROTESTANT," it is not because AMICUS VERITATIS was silenced by the absurd reasoning and the calumnious imputations against the most numerous and most respectable body of Christians in the world; (absurd, indeed, when Pope Clement VIII. was represented to have granted a dispensation to Henry VIII. six years before he was born, and sixty-one years before he was Pope,) but because the Letters of A. V. have been refused insertion in the GLASGOW CHRONICLE, under pretence that the other party had withdrawn. AMICUS VERITATIS, therefore, leaves the public to judge how far it was consistent with impartiality to give insertion to aspersions against Catholics, and to refuse insertion to the refutation of those aspersions.

GLASGOW, 16th July, 1818.

THE

Protestant,

No. I.

SATURDAY, JULY 18th, 1818.

MY controversy with the Papists originated in a paragraph, supposed to be written by one of them, in the Glasgow Chronicle, relating to an Oratorio, which had been performed in their Chapel, for the benefit of the Catholic Schools. A few remarks made on that paragraph brought forth a reply from AMICUS VERITATIS; and another Letter from me produced a second from a person, under the same signature, and one by another Papist, under the Signature of PAX. The controversy was continued in the Glasgow Chronicle, till it began to assume a shape, and take an extent of range, such as to render it impossible that the Editor of a public journal could give place to the discussion with any degree of regularity. I have, therefore, determined to publish a Paper every Saturday, under the above title; and if I am favoured by the countenance of the public, I may continue to do so for some considerable time.

I intend to follow my opponents through all their windings—to refute what they assert, and confirm what they deny; for their letters hitherto consist of little more than bare assertion, and bare denial, with a good deal of abuse, in which it has been my study not to imitate them; for though I have written, and may still write, with great severity, against the system of Popery, and the wickedness of its abettors in general, I have abstained from attacking individuals by name, whether ancient or modern, while they (at least one of them) have poured a torrent of abuse against the persons of men, to whom the world is indebted for all that it enjoys this day of civil and religious liberty.

The present Paper is published in the form in which it was intended for the Glasgow Chronicle of last Tuesday.

SIR,

I NOW sit down to answer the Letter of your Correspondent, PAX, which appeared in your Paper of June 18th. He has a quotation from Addison, which I do not profess to understand, in its connexion with other matter. He talks of my fallacious assertions—my prejudices—venom of prejudice—my spirit of persecution—my absurd sophistry—the unholy edifice which I have reared with my own hands, at the expense of my neighbours' nicest feelings—of my own integrity as a writer, and my charity as a Christian. I do not profess to answer this. I never studied at Billingsgate college; and have little skill in the art of calling names. I am quite deaf to the cry of bigotry which is reiterated in every Letter of my opponents. The continued outcry by Papists against bigotry, reminds me of the thief who was the first and the loudest to cry "Catch thief!" that he might remove suspicion from himself, and escape in the crowd.

He accuses me of arguing upon mere suspicion, without the support of a single fact; and being silent upon those truths which are opposed to my fallacious assertions. PAX was here cutting before the point. The Letter which he was answering, was professedly an introduction to a series of Letters, in which I promised to go over, and answer, all the objectionable matter contained in his Letter, and that of his friend, A. V. It was rather too much to expect that the introduction should contain all that the work was meant to contain: yet such seems to have been the expectation of Mr. PAX. I hope he will read over all the Letters which I have since written on the subject, and if he does not confess, I think he ought to confess, that I have given of facts *quantum sufficit*.

He seems to enjoy his triumph very heartily; and far should I be from depriving him of any enjoyment which he may have in this controversy. It seems "every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance" which I had made in my former Letter. He defied me to produce the Kilravack Bull, with the meaning I had ascribed to it. This would have been very fair, if I had said the Bull was in my possession, or in the possession of any person to whom I had immediate access. All that I asserted was, that a Rev. Gentleman had assured me he had seen it, and that such were its contents. This gentleman is willing to meet with PAX any day, and maintain his assertion, and to bring other witnesses to vouch for the fact. In short, the document has been seen by hundreds; and PAX may see it himself, if he shall please to make a pilgrimage to Kilravack. I venture to

assure him, he will find it as good for his soul as a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Loretta, and far less expensive.

He makes some insinuations here, which ought not to be passed over slightly. He speaks as if he took me for a Jesuit, who could shuffle, and quibble, and say the thing which is not; in short, he means it to be understood that I had asserted what I could not make good concerning this Bull; and that I had recourse to the mean subterfuge of slurring over the matter with an apology on account of the absence of my witness. I think PAX would not, on such slight grounds, have made this uncandid insinuation, if he had not been habituated to the quibbling, shuffling arts to which Papists always have recourse, in the defence of their system. It is not easy for an honest man to suspect his neighbour of dishonesty; but a rogue suspects all who are about him. If PAX be an honest man, he will confess that he has wronged his neighbour, and I shall not insist on his doing penance: at least, he shall not, if I can help it, be obliged to walk round his chapel on his bare knees, as some of his brethren and sisters in Ireland do, till the blood flow from the flesh stuck full of small stones.

He also defied me to prove, that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin. Without quibbling about the Popish meaning of the word indulgence, I have proved from a variety of documents, to which I refer him, that the Pope and his Bishops claimed and exercised the power of granting the remission of sins to those who paid them for it. I have proved that an indulgence, or permission to commit the grossest sins, might have been procured for half-a-guinea. I have proved, in the words of a celebrated Divine of the Romish Church (see your Paper of June 23d,) that of the greatest crimes, there were some that persons might have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they had been committed, might be bought. This fact, and the existence of the book which contained the price of pardon for certain sins, are asserted by Claude D'Espence; and A. V. slurs this over without any remark, while he is calling all my other documents forgeries. If PAX be able to look a heretic in the face, I invite him to call on me, and I will show him such a list of pardons proclaimed, and of course granted, to all who would purchase them, as perhaps he never saw in his life. For instance, "Pope Sextus hath given and granted to every brother and sister that shall visit the said altar (that is, the great altar of St. Hilary) upon the 2d day of June, and the 16th day of July, every year, for every of the said days, a plenary remission of all their sins."—"Pope Innocent hath granted to the said brothers and sisters, upon Easter-day, and eight days following, four thousand years of quarantains, and remission of the third part of all their sins. *Item*, he hath granted to Twelfth-day, and the octaves thereof,

five thousand years : to the day of the nativity of our Lady, and the octaves of it, thirty thousand years of true pardon."—"Pope Sextus IV. hath granted to the said brothers and sisters that shall visit the said altar in the church of St. Hilary, on which the blessed sacrament of the altar standeth, upon any of the festivals of our Lady, from the first vespers to the second, plenary pardon of all their sins. *Imprimis*, The first day of Lent, three thousand years of true pardon, and plenary remission of his sins, over and above. Thursday, ten thousand years. Friday, ten thousand years. The first Sunday in Lent, eighteen thousand years of pardon, and remission of all his sins to boot. Monday, ten thousand years, and a plenary indulgence. Tuesday, twenty-eight thousand years, and as many quarantains (or periods of forty days,) and the remission of the third part of their sins, and the delivery of one soul out of purgatory," &c. &c. &c. See *Eccles. Hist. France*, 4to. p. 222—224. There are several quarto pages of such matter : the above is extracted merely as a sample.

Who would not imagine from this, that the Pope possessed an infinite fulness of grace and mercy? This, indeed, is what he wished to be understood. He placed himself in the seat of God, showing himself as God—able to open and shut the gates of heaven at his pleasure. But when any poor sinner came to claim the benefit of that grace which the Pope possessed in such abundance, he found there was no grace for him, unless he could pay for it, which made it in fact no grace at all.—Christ invites the chief of sinners to come to him, and receive all the blessings of salvation, without money and without price ; but the Pope in this, as in every other part of his system, is Antichrist, that is, opposed to Christ,—there is no pardon, no blessing of any kind, to be obtained from him, except in some rare instances, without money. Such is the cruelty of the system—such is the hard-heartedness of the whole priesthood, that, though they profess to have the power of releasing souls from the pains of purgatory, they will not do it without payment. Not to speak of Christian principle, no man of ordinary humanity would suffer his neighbour to remain one hour under the pain of the tooth-ache, if he could afford relief ; but thousands of souls may lie wallowing in the fiery lake for thousands of years ; and though the priests have the power, not one will move a finger to release them, till he be paid for it. There is no need of colouring here ; the monstrous deformity of the system appears on its very front.

The only apology that can be made for the priests is, that they do not themselves believe in purgatory. If this apology be sustained, then they are guilty of robbing the poor people who confide in them, by means of lies and imposition. If they do believe in purgatory, and that the souls in it suffer greater misery

than any creature can suffer in this world ; and if, believing this, they will not grant the relief which they can grant, till some poor relative has parted with his last shilling as a price for it, then the priests stand convicted of a cruelty of disposition, which will scarcely find a parallel among the most barbarous savages.

In the above quotations, there are so many thousand years of true pardon granted to those who shall visit the altar ; but it is well known, that the visiting of the altar was nothing but for the gift that was left at the altar. The expression *true* pardon, too, which is often repeated, seems to intimate that there was such a thing as *false* pardon, or pardon falsely granted, which is perhaps the only true thing which the poor people were taught to believe.

PAX, in a parenthesis, gives us a piece of very important information :—" A person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence." It is well known that indulgences have been given to thousands. Is it then to be understood, that all the persons to whom they were granted, were in a state of sinless purity ? Certainly ; otherwise, according to PAX's own showing, the indulgence was of no use ; and those who bought such favours were swindled out of their money. From this plain avowal of the Popish doctrine, we are led to the conclusion, that every person to whom an indulgence is granted, is, in the esteem of the church, a sinless person. He was brought into this state by means of the sacrament of penance, and the absolution of the priest : he is taught to believe that the priest really can grant such absolution ; and that there is a virtue in the sacrament of penance fully adequate to cancel all his guilt. Now, suppose it possible that persons so absolved and purified are still sinners, notwithstanding the mysterious process which they have undergone—a supposition by no means irrelevant ; and supposing they should die in this state, they are undone for ever : and the church has swindled them not only out of their money, but out of their everlasting happiness. It was foretold of this church, that her traffic would be in " the souls of men ;" and who can tell how many millions of souls she has sold to perdition !

To direct a sinner to any thing but the merits of Christ for the pardon of sin, is to deceive him ; and if he be so simple as to believe what he is told, he is utterly undone. The Church of Rome stands convicted of thus deceiving and ruining those that confide in her. Some unknown friend has sent me, through the Chronicle Office, a Douay Catechism, from which I abstract the following, on the subject of penance. " Q. What is penance ? A. A sacrament, by which the sins we fall into, after baptism, are forgiven us. Q. When did Christ ordain this sacrament ? A. After his rising from the dead, when he breathed on his disciples,

saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained. John xx. 23. Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. The sins of the penitent, accompanied by contrition and satisfaction. Q. What is the form of it? A. I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Q. What are the effects of it? A. It reconciles us to God, and either restores or increases grace. Q. How many parts has it, as it concerns the penitent? A. Three ; contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Q. What is contrition? A. A hearty sorrow for, and detestation of, our sins, by which we have offended so good a God ; with a firm purpose of amendment. Q. What is confession? A. A full and sincere declaring of all our sins to our ghostly father. Q. What is satisfaction? A. A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest, to whom we confess. Q. What is required to a good confession? A. 1. That we seriously examine our consciences ; 2. Be heartily sorry for all our sins, with a firm purpose to amend, taking care and time to make an act of contrition ; and, 3. Confess them faithfully to the priest. Q. What is a firm purpose of amendment? A. It is a resolution, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it. Q. What if a man knowingly leave out one mortal sin? A. He commits a great sacrilege, by lying to the Holy Ghost, and makes his whole confession nothing worth. Q. What is an indulgence? A. Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church ; but only a releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us, by the sacrament of penance."

Such are the principles of the Douay Catechism, on the subject of penance and indulgence. Your readers will see they are not very different from those of the French Catechism, which I quoted in a former Letter ; except that, instead of giving indulgence the honour of a section by itself, they attach it to the end of the section on penance. The Catechism before me, indeed, is only an abstract, and does not go so much into detail as the French one ; but the ground-work and leading principles, so far as I have compared them, are substantially the same.

Let any intelligent person consider the extract which I have made from the acknowledged standard of the Church of Rome, as it exists in Britain, and say, if it be not a mass of error and corruption throughout. Here the priest is every thing, and Christ is little or nothing. In fact Christ is nothing at all in the Popish system, after he had delegated his authority to the priests. Most absurdly they apply to themselves what Christ said to his inspired apostles ; and then they take the whole work

of Christ into their own hands, as if he had left the entire charge of his church to them. The priest administers the sacrament of penance ; this takes away all the sins committed after baptism (the sins before baptism were taken away by that rite :) the priest absolves from all sin ; this sacrament reconciles the sinner to God : there is no occasion to confess sin to God ; it is enough that the sinner confess to his ghostly father : there is no need of the atonement of Christ ; a faithful performance of the prayers and good works enjoined by the priest is sufficient satisfaction : and if the sinner, in confessing to the priest, should knowingly omit one mortal sin, it is the same as lying to the Holy Ghost, so that the authority of the Holy Ghost and of the priest are the same. In short, the principle of the system is, that poor perishing sinners must commit themselves implicitly to the care of their ghostly fathers ; and, instead of trusting in God, in whom alone salvation is to be found, incur the curse of trusting in man, in whom there is no help.

I should not much object to the definition of the word contrition, as above quoted from the Catechism, if it stood connected with the animating principle which alone can produce genuine repentance or contrition. It has, however, no such connexion, though it seems to relate to an act of the sinner's own, which he must take "care and time to make ;" that is, an "*act of contrition*," which stands in the front of the Catechism, as follows :— "O Sovereign Lord, because I love thee above all things, I am heartily sorry that ever I offended thee ; I hate and detest all my sins, because they are displeasing to thee, my good God ; and I firmly purpose and resolve, through thy grace, never more to offend thee. Amen." Such is the act which all Papists are taught by their church to make ; and with regard to most of them, I am afraid, it commences by telling their Maker a lie to his face. How few are there who can truly say they love the Lord above all things !

It is not my intention to reply to A. V.'s late Letters, till I have done with some previous matter ; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of informing him, that, in his Letter in your Paper of the 11th instant, he has given his system a wound, which he will not soon be able to cure. Speaking of the book which contained the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, which was put in the list of prohibited books by the Council of Trent, he says, "No book is prohibited, but such as contains doctrine contrary to the tenets of the Catholic faith." Now it is a fact, that the same Council of Trent put the Bible, as well as the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, in the list of prohibited books. The Bible, therefore, by A. V.'s own acknowledgment, contains doctrine contrary to the Catholic faith, and is of course condemned by

the authority of the Church But perhaps he will call the Bible forgery, like almost every thing else that contains a word against his infallible Church.

In a future Letter, I shall quote the authority of the Council of Trent at length on this subject. In the meantime, your readers may rest assured of the fact, that the Bible is under the fourth rule concerning prohibited books, and not to be read in the vulgar tongue, without special permission of a priest, granted in writing, under the heaviest penalty known to a Papist—that of not receiving the pardon of his sins; and the rule proceeds upon this very certain ground, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where without difference, in the vulgar tongue, it does more harm than good, through the rashness of men.—I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

July 13th, 1818.

THE

Protestant,

No. II.

SATURDAY, JULY 25th, 1818.

AT the conclusion of my last, I convicted AMICUS VERITATIS of admitting that the Bible contained "doctrines contrary to the tenets of the Catholic faith." I believe I might very honourably terminate the controversy here; for persons who make the above admission, and still adhere to the Church of Rome, are not to be reasoned with as Christians. For the sake of society, however, if not for their own sakes, it is necessary to continue the controversy, in order to expose the impositions which such men practise upon the public; that, if they cannot be put to silence by fair argument, the world may be convinced that their testimony is not to be believed.

I shall deviate a little farther from my plan, in order to remove as soon as possible the impression that may have been made on the mind of some readers, by A. V.'s assertions with regard to the character and doctrine of Luther. That I may do A. V. no injustice, I shall begin by quoting the whole passage. He asserted that a certain passage in Luther's works "contains a perpetual indulgence to commit adultery, in certain circumstances." He now repeats, "that Luther did preach the doctrine in question is certain. He tells us, that whilst he continued a Catholic monk, he observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gave himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer; whereas, after he became a Reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence; to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious

woman who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above, and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters*, pp. 158, 159. The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are,—‘ Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut fœmina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas.—Tertia ratio divortii est ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habit are cum eo renuerit. Hic opportunum est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera velit: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla.’ *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt.* Tom. V. fol. 119, 123. The Works of Luther are preserved in the Library of the University of Glasgow, where your Correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect he will be as good as his word.”

My word was, that if I found, upon examining Luther's own words, he really held and taught the doctrines imputed to him by A. V., I should publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. Certainly I should do so, if I found the fact to be as A. V. states it; for I have no interest in defending the errors of Luther or of any other man; but the fact is, Luther taught no such errors; and A. V.'s pretended extract from his Works is a piece of as barefaced imposition as ever was palmed upon the public.

I have to thank the Librarian of the University here, who, at the expense of some inconvenience to himself, the Library being shut at this season, gave me an opportunity of inspecting Luther's Works, which consist of seven immense folio volumes. The words are correctly given by A. V. as far as the word *ancella*, which ought to be *ancilla*; this, however, is of little consequence, as it may be a mistake of the Printer. After *ancilla*, Luther has a comma, and then he proceeds to explain the necessary steps to be taken before a man can lawfully put away his wife, and take another. I shall give the whole sentence as it stands in Luther, that the reader may see how much he has been abused by modern Papists. “ Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla, ita tamen ut antea iterum et tertium uxorem admoneat maritus, et coram aliis ejus etiam pertinaciam detegat, ut publice et ante conspectum Ecclesiæ duritia ejus et agnoscat et reprehendatur.” This is a part of Luther's third reason of divorce. He is maintaining that in certain circumstances it is lawful for a man to put away his wife and take another,—“ yet so that before this, the husband admonish his wife, not once only, but a second, and a third time, and also expose her obstinacy before others, that publicly, and in presence of the church, her obstinacy may be known and repre-

nended." But A. V. stops at the word *ancilla* : for a comma he substitutes a period, and omits all the rest of the sentence, which makes Luther appear to teach, that, without ceremony, a man may take his handmaid instead of his wife. In this way, A. V. will prove the Psalmist to be an atheist. His very words, in the fourteenth Psalm, are, " There is no God."

If not quite hardened, A. V. must blush when he sees his wickedness thus exposed. This is the man who makes such an outcry against the Protestants for forgery, and who maintains, on the authority of Whitaker, that no such practice was to be found among Papists. I wish Whitaker were alive ; I should tell him of a Papist who commits forgery ; for, to garble a man's words, and make him say what he does not mean to say, is as really forgery as to put a man's name to a document which he never saw. I advise A. V. to beware of such tricks, lest some worse thing befall him than the lash of a Protestant.

Some of my friends accused me of want of charity, when I said, in one of my Letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, " I believe A. V. knows more than he chooses to make known." I feel myself quite justified in making the assertion. He must know very well that the passage in Luther, when fairly quoted, gives not the least countenance to the abominable charge which he unblushingly brought against the Reformer ; but he did not choose to make this known. The doctrine of Luther is substantially the same that is taught by the soundest casuists, and which is laid down from the Apostolic writings, in the Westminster Confession Chap. XXIV. §. 6. Luther, indeed, does not speak with so much delicacy on a delicate subject, as a modern divine would do ; but that fault was common to him, with most writers of his time, and for two hundred years afterwards. Our own Queen Mary, one of the idols of Papists, did not always write in such language as would become a young lady in the present day.

The extract given by A. V. with the necessary addition which I have made to it from Luther's works, consists of two unconnected passages, of which I need not give a literal translation, as I confess the expression is somewhat coarse. But I appeal to better scholars than myself, whether the following be not the meaning which a liberal translator would give it, expressing the same ideas in modern language. Luther is speaking of man and woman, and of their being made for one another. Speaking in name of the former, he says, it was not of himself that he was made so ; then, as addressing the latter, he says the same of her ; and the inference which he draws with regard to both is, that the one ought not to be without the other. Is not this perfectly consistent with the declaration of the Creator concerning Adam, while in a state of innocency,—" It is not good that man

should be alone." The third reason of divorce is, when one party withdraws from the other, and will not perform due benevolence, or refuses to dwell with the other: in this case, a husband may tell his wife that he will take another, but not privately, or on his own authority; but repeated admonition must be given to her before the church, as Luther's words are literally translated at the bottom of the second page: that is, she must be divorced before the husband is warranted to put her away,—or, in other words, that a regular process of divorce must be led, before he can marry another. I see nothing in this contrary to the word of God; and I believe it is perfectly consistent with the law, both in England and Scotland.

The Papists were never able to fix the smallest charge of any thing bordering upon unchastity upon Luther, except that he married a wife. It is utterly false that "he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence," &c. Whatever such men as A. V. or Milner may say, regardless of their character, or confident of escaping detection, the advocates of Popery, in former days, were too well informed of the truth, and too conscious that they would be exposed, to hazard any such assertion. All that the bishop of Meaux, when speaking of the strong language which Luther used on the necessity of marriage as a remedy against unchastity, says, is, "I cannot think how he will be able to reconcile this with the life which, according to his own account, he led in the most spotless manner, during all the time of his celibacy, and till he was forty-five years of age." *Hist. de Variations*, lib. 3., num. 49. All the world know that Luther was apt to use strong, and even unguarded language; but nothing but ignorant or malevolent effrontery could induce any one to accuse him of such actions and sentiments as A. V. lays to his charge. So far from making the confession alleged, in a letter to his friend Amsdorff, written at the time of his marriage, he says: "Ego enim nec amo, nec æstuo, sed diligo uxorem;" and he assigns as the principal reason for his marrying, that he might, by his own example, trample upon an iniquitous law, which was the source of so much immorality and flagitiousness. *Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheranismi*, lib. 2., pp. 16, 19. In fact, Luther speaks with great indifference of marriage, so far as regarded himself, but, knowing the monstrous wickedness which the celibacy of the priests occasioned, he strongly recommended marriage to others, and in doing so he was supported by the authority of the word of God.

A. V. expresses his "surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquainted with, but ignorant of the opinions of the great father of his own." Luther is not the father of my religion. It

would be a sad thing for Protestants, if their religion were derived from a book which is to be seen, perhaps, no where in the kingdom, but within the walls of the Glasgow University. Though I claim no relation to Luther more than to any other Christian, I am happy that I have it in my power to vindicate his character from the aspersions of an anonymous libeller, who abuses the liberty which he enjoys in a free country, for the vilest purposes of defamation. I never thought highly of the morality of Papists; but A. V. has made me think more meanly of it than ever. He abuses other venerable names besides that of Luther: but as his charges against them are not of so gross a nature, nor supported by such *apparent* evidence, I shall not take up their cause at present, but proceed in my reply to PAX, from which I have been diverted, by a desire of making a speedy exposure of A. V.'s falsehood and impudence.

PAX seems very much offended by my continued use of the word Papist; and because I do not use the term Roman Catholic, like some of our Senators, who were enlightened enough to see that it was improper to use the word Catholic exclusively to denote the Church of Rome. I confess, I am not so easily satisfied on this point as these worthy Senators must have been. I do not call the members of the Church of Rome, Papists, because it is a term of reproach, but because they have not furnished me with another term which does not imply, on my part, the concession of some important principle. I have already given my reasons for not calling them Catholics; and for nearly the same reasons, I cannot call them Roman Catholics. The word Catholic signifies universal. In the nature of the thing, there cannot be more than one universal Church; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ throughout the world, together with those who have gone to heaven. This is very different from any visible organized church; and certainly it is not the Church of Rome. To use the term of Roman Catholic, is to admit that the Church of Rome is in some sense universal, which it never was; or that it is the only true Church, for there cannot be two universal churches. I say the Church of Rome never was catholic, or universal. It never prevailed over the whole world. It was never universal, even in what is called Christendom; for, not to speak of the Greek Church, which remains to this day a separate communion, it never prevailed universally in the West of Europe. The Culdees in our own country, for instance, maintained a long and a noble struggle against the errors and the encroachments of Rome; and they continued to do so, till the Waldenses had thrown off her galling yoke. The melody of a simple and spiritual worship did not cease to ascend from the glens and moun-

tains of Scotland, till it began to be heard in the vallies of Piedmont ; and till the inhabitants of the rocky Alps had learned to sing the praises of their Redeemer.

The true Church of Christ was driven into the wilderness ; but it was not in the power of Rome to destroy her altogether. The Culdees were not finally overcome till the twelfth century ; and, in that same century, the Waldenses had become a great eye-sore to Rome. " In Scotland," says the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, " the Culdean doctrine had taken deeper root ; and, although equally offensive to the votaries of Rome, it kept its ground for several centuries. The Popish writers themselves celebrate the piety, the purity, and the humility, and even the learning, of the Culdees : but while they were displeased with the simplicity, of what they deemed the barbarism, of their worship, they charged them with various deviations from the faith of the Catholic Church. It was not the least of these that they did not observe Easter at the proper time. They did not acknowledge auricular confession ; they rejected penance and authoritative absolution ; they made no use of chrism* in baptism ; confirmation was unknown ; they opposed the doctrine of the real presence ; they withstood the idolatrous worship of saints and angels, dedicating all their churches to the Holy Trinity ; they denied the doctrine of works of supererogation ; they were enemies to the celibacy of the clergy, themselves living in the married state. One sweeping charge brought against them is, that they preferred their own opinions to the statutes of the holy fathers. The Scots, having received the Christian faith by the labours of the Culdees, long withstood the errors and usurpations of Rome."

This information respecting our ancestors will, I hope, be interesting to my readers ; and it may lead some to conclude, that the effect of the simple mode of worship practised by the Culdees, in all their churches, is visible in Scotland to this day.

Rome having succeeded at last in extinguishing the light in Scotland, it broke out with greater brightness on the Continent. " Of all the sects that arose in this century," says Mosheim, " none was more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from their parent and founder, PETER WALDUS." " They complained that the Roman Church had degenerated, under Constantine the Great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. They maintained that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences, belonged to

* A mixture of oil and balsam, consecrated by a Popish Bishop, to be used in baptism, confirmation, &c.

God alone: and that *indulgences*, of consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd; and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or thrust down to hell."

In short, the same doctrines which were taught by Luther and the other Reformers were maintained by greater or smaller numbers of Christians, in different parts of the world, even in the darkest ages. The translator of Mosheim says very properly "When the Papists ask us, Where our religion was before Luther? we generally answer, In the Bible; and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may add to this answer,—and in the vallies of Piedmont."* to which I may add,—and on the mountains of Scotland.

* Perhaps no body of Christians, since the days of the Roman Emperors, suffered more severe persecution than the Waldenses did, at the instigation of the Roman Pontiff. As a specimen of the Popish method of converting heretics, I shall give a few extracts from a bull of Pope INNOCENT VIII. in which he requires the Archdeacon of Cremona to extirpate that simple and harmless people. This was thirty years before the Reformation. "We have heard," says the Pope, "and it has come to our knowledge, not without much displeasure, that certain sons of iniquity, followers of that abominable and pernicious sect of malignant men, called the poor of Lyons, or Waldenses, who have long endeavoured, in Piedmont and other places, to ensnare the sheep belonging to God, to the perdition of their souls, having damnably risen up, under a feigned pretence of holiness—being given up to a reprobate sense, and made to err greatly from the way of truth—committing things contrary to the orthodox faith, offensive to the eyes of the divine Majesty, and which occasion a great hazard of souls." He then declares that he has constituted Albert his Nuncio, Commissioner, "to the end that you should induce the followers of the most wicked sect of the Waldenses, and all others polluted with heretical pravity, to abjure their errors. And, calling to your assistance all Archbishops and Bishops seated in the said Duchy (of Savoy) whom the Most High hath called to share with us in our cares, with the Inquisitor, the Ordinaries of the Place, their Vicars, &c. you proceed to the execution thereof against the foresaid Waldenses, and all other heretics whatever, to rise up in arms against them, and, by joint communication of processes, to tread them under foot as venomous adders; diligently providing that the people committed to their charge do persevere in the profession of the true faith—bending all your endeavours, and bestowing all your care, towards so holy and so necessary an extermination of the same heretics." "Thou, therefore, my beloved son, taking upon thee, with a devout mind, the burden of so meritorious a work, show thyself, in the execution thereof, so careful in word and deed, and so diligent and studious, that the much wished-for fruits may, through the grace of God, redound unto thee from thy labours, and that thou mayest not only obtain the crown of glory, which is bestowed as a reward to those that prosecute pious causes, but that thou mayest also ensure the approbation of us, and of the Apostolic See. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, 27th Ap. 1487, and 3d of our Popedom." *Jones' Hist. Wald.* 1st ed. pp. 466—468.

The Church of Rome, therefore, never was universal, or catholic; and I cannot consistently call her members Roman Catholics; but I have no objection to call them Romists, if that shall please them better than Papists. Under one or other of these terms they must be content to be called after their head, like other sects, and with more propriety than most other sects, for they own the Pope to be the head of their Church, whereas, few other Christian sects acknowledge any head upon earth.

I see, in the Glasgow Chronicle of Saturday last, an advertisement by A. V. in which I am apprized of a small mistake with regard to the Pope, who offered to indulge Henry VIII. with two wives. It seems I had given the Pope an I too much, and had written Clement VIII. instead of Clement VII. This trifling error occasions great triumph to A. V. who makes out from it that all my arguments are absurd indeed. From this I infer, that, in the esteem of A. V. himself, this is the greatest matter he could find against me, as he blazons it forth in the middle of his short advertisement. Now this error is actually nothing at all with regard to my argument. The fact is, that the Pope of the day made the above proposal to the King of England. The thing was done—it matters not what was the number of the name of the beast that did it.

I intend, as soon as I can make it convenient, to publish, from the Glasgow Chronicle, my Letters from the commencement, in a separate form.

THE

Protestant,

No. III.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 1st, 1818.

Pax tells us, that "the principles of the Catholic Church do not emanate from a Pope, but from the great Founder of the Christian faith." This is true of the really Catholic, or universal Church, but not true of the Romish Church. Some of the fundamental principles of Christianity, such as the Trinity, and the divinity of Christ, are indeed admitted in the Popish system; but they are so blended with human errors, as to be in a great measure neutralized, and rendered inefficient for the purpose of saving sinners. From the divinity of Christ, we infer the sufficiency and the virtue of his atonement, and his supreme and exclusive authority in matters of faith and Christian practice. But the benefit of this is lost in the Church of Rome, by setting up her own authority and that of her priests, as sufficient in matters of faith; and by directing sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves. Hear the Douay Catechism, which A. V. says is approved by the whole Church, and put into the hands of all their children for their religious instruction. "Q. Is any great honour due to priests and ghostly (*i. e.* spiritual) fathers? A. Yes: for they are God's anointed, represent the person of Christ, and are the fathers and feeders of our souls. Q. In what are we bound to believe and obey them? A. In all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls." This is, in language sufficiently plain, setting aside the authority of Christ altogether. Papists are taught implicitly to believe all things belonging to faith, which a priest may tell them—that is all things believable; and

though it may seem strange to persons who think and reason upon principles of common sense, Papists are taught by their priests to believe a great deal more than what is believable.

Now, who are these priests in whom the poor people are commanded to put such confidence? They are merely men like themselves. They were never taken into the council of the Almighty, that they should know more of his will than other men. They were never favoured with a revelation from heaven in their private ear. No heavenly messenger was ever sent to them, to teach them what others could not know. They may, indeed, pretend to converse with angels, and to have communications from heaven; but I defy the whole priesthood to exhibit one evidence of this. Grant, then, for a moment, that all the priests of the Romish Church, in all ages, were as decent and sober as those in Scotland are, in the present day, not one of them, nor all of them together, could be worthy of being obeyed in any one article of faith, or of being implicitly believed in any one matter of religion.

How much more, when the prevailing character of the priests was the opposite of what I have supposed? Is it possible, that, while living in all sorts of wickedness, the Almighty should speak to men by their mouth? The truth which God has revealed for the salvation of sinners has a purifying influence, and its moral effects are invariably seen in those who believe it. It is certain, the greater part of the priests themselves did not believe it, else they would not have lived such profligate lives. Were they then to be implicitly believed in a matter in which they did not believe themselves? If they taught what they did believe, it must have been error and falsehood, and those who trusted in them, must have been deceived and ruined. Upon the supposition, that the priests are not now such grossly wicked men, as they once were, (and it cannot be denied, that the Reformation has had a happy influence even upon the Popish priesthood, especially in Protestant countries;) upon the supposition, that they are even good men, they are liable to err like all others, and ought not to be believed in any matter of faith whatever, unless they can produce divine authority for what they say; and then it is not the priest that is believed, but God himself. Whatever may be the character of the individual trusted in, the Bible declares the misery of the man that trusteth in man.

With regard to the atonement of Christ, on which alone the hopes of a sinner can safely rest for pardon and peace, the Church of Rome makes it of no value, by virtually denying its sufficiency; which they do, by teaching men to add the merits of saints, and their own merits to it. Nothing can be more dishonourable to Christ than this. It is, in fact, reducing him to

the rank of a mere creature, who died for sin in vain, if the sinner must yet make atonement, in whole or in part, for himself, or if he must have recourse to the merits of other creatures to help him. Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished;" and how impious and presumptuous is it to attempt to add to his FINISHED work! As well might a worm add to the magnitude and brightness of the sun.

The doctrine of indulgences certainly did not emanate from the great Founder of the Christian faith. A good deal has been said on this subject already. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved all that I asserted of it; and I have abundance of materials in reserve, to prove the unparalleled wickedness of the Church of Rome, in this single branch of her traffic. But at present I shall not have recourse to any other document, than that to which A. V. refers me. The Douay Catechism, he tells me, is approved by the whole Church. I confess Popery appears in it considerably softened down, and divested of much of its grossness. I have no evidence, however, of this Catechism being approved by the whole Church of Rome; for that Church has not met in general council for nearly three hundred years; and this Catechism does not profess to have been approved by the council of Trent, or any other council. It is not authenticated by any authority whatever; there is no name to vouch for it, but that of the printer; whereas the French Catechism is sanctioned by the authority of the Pope, and the Archbishop of Paris. Unauthenticated as the Douay Catechism is, it may be either admitted or denied by Papists, to contain the faith of their Church. AMICUS VERITATIS, however, cannot have this advantage; for I find the Catechism before me contains the very words which he quoted from it in one of his letters, on the doctrine of indulgence. It is therefore sufficiently authentic for every purpose of my controversy with him.

Now, I intend to show that, modified as it is, the doctrine of indulgence is not one that emanates from the great Founder of Christianity; but that it is directly opposed to Christianity. I shall give the precise words of the Catechism. "What is an indulgence?" "Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church, but only a releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance."

Here it seems the Church of Rome teaches, that sin may be forgiven, and yet the person who committed it be liable to punishment. This is inconsistent with the whole tenor of Scripture. When God pardons the sins of his people, he is said to remember them no more. Not that the knowledge of them can escape out of his mind; but he does not remember them so as to exact

the penalty, or punishment of them. He exacted the whole penalty of his own Son, when he stood in the place of the guilty: it was exacted of him, and he answered; he paid the whole debt; he made complete atonement, when he gave himself up to God a sacrifice for sin. He that believes in Christ, is justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses. He is justified from the guilt, and released from the punishment, which his sins deserved. There is a necessary connexion between guilt and punishment; when the former is taken away, the latter cannot, with justice, be inflicted.

I know that Popish writers distinguish between the *culpa* and the *pæna*, that is, the *guilt* and the *punishment*, and certainly they are different and distinguishable things: but it is quite contrary to Scripture, to say, that the one can be taken away, and the other remain. It is of no consequence that it is only temporal punishment that is said to be released by an indulgence. I could easily show, from Popish writers, that the church affected to release sinners from both the *culpa* and the *pæna*, not for time only, but for ever. But I am arguing at present from the Douay Catechism, which ascribes to an indulgence the power of releasing from temporal punishment only. But if it be admitted that punishment of any kind is due, then the guilt cannot have been taken away. Punishment, in this world, is as really an expression of divine wrath against sin, as punishment in the next world. But when God pardons a sinner, his wrath is turned away from him: he accepts the satisfaction made by Christ in his death, as sufficient punishment for all the sins of all his people; but to suppose punishment, either temporal or eternal, still due to a believer, is to set aside the atonement of Christ.

Papists, and perhaps some Protestants, will reply to this, that believers, real Christians, suffer much in this world in consequence of their sins; and that it must be very desirable to have an indulgence, or to be exempted from such sufferings. It is true, believers do often suffer much in consequence of their sins. Though we maintain that they are perfectly justified before God, on account of Christ's righteousness, we do not consider them to be personally without sin, as Papists consider those who have had their sins forgiven by the sacrament of penance. Consistent Protestants know nothing of sinless perfection in this world. They do not pretend to it, and the less they do the better. While in the world, therefore, they must suffer affliction, because sin, the cause of all suffering, adheres to them. But the afflictions of Christians do not partake of the nature of punishment,—they are not penal, but salutary; they are the necessary and merciful discipline of our heavenly Father, who, when he does chasten his people, it is for their profit, that they may be partakers of his holi-

ness. If they have the Spirit of Christ, who dwells in all Christians they would not wish exemption from this, much less would they purchase exemption in the form of an indulgence. They are taught to believe, that though no affliction for the present be joyous but grievous, yet afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness in them that are exercised thereby.

But Papists profess to grant exemption from the temporal punishment due on account of sins which have been forgiven. If such punishment be due, then the atonement of Christ is set aside as unavailing. If it be granted that the work of Christ is sufficient, and fully available, for the justification of the ungodly; but that the Church grants indulgence, or exemption from the afflictions with which God is pleased to visit his people, for the purpose of their sanctification, then the Church sets herself up to counteract and oppose the work of Christ in his people, by professing to exempt them from what He declares to be good for them, and which they must not be without. Take either part of the dilemma, and there is no avoiding both, and the Church of Rome is proved to oppose herself, both to the authority of Christ, and the grace of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, then, it is not true, that the principles of the Romish Church emanate from the great Founder of Christianity, as PAX asserts. They emanate from human ignorance and error; and even when Papists profess to hold, in words, some of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, they make them void by their own traditions. To add any thing to the authority, or to the atonement of Christ, is as bad as to renounce both. On this ground the Church of Rome stands convicted of being the Anti-christ spoken of by the apostle Paul, as the "man of sin and son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

It is, indeed, of little use to argue with Papists from the Bible. This is an authority to which they pay little regard, unless it happen to be backed by the authority of their priests; and some of the priests themselves know little of what it contains. I could direct the reader to an individual of this holy order,—one who "is to be believed and obeyed in all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls,"—not one in some dark country like Spain, but one in our own enlightened country, who, when he was referred to the prophecy of Jeremiah in support of an argument, and the Bible put into his hand, that he might read the passage, really did not know where to find the book of Jeremiah! If the blind lead the blind, we know what shall be the consequence; and there is no blindness so fatal as that of having the eyes shut against the light of God's word.

Papists shut their eyes against this light upon principle; and prefer the darkness which emanates from their priests and ghostly fathers. One of the orators in the Council of Trent maintained, that "the Scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines; and that they ought not to be made a study, because the Lutherans only gained those that read them." This was not the opinion of a mere individual, but of the Council, with the Pope at its head, whose decrees were professedly given under the authority of the Holy Ghost, as is evident by their canon upon the subject. I did not say, that the principles of Popery emanated from the Pope; the Pope himself emanated from the spirit of error and ambition, which began to work in the churches at a very early period, and which has continued to this day.

"If a Pope," says PAX, "were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed." I believe a Pope is seldom guilty of preaching any thing; and it may be true, in one sense, that he does not teach any thing contrary to the Testament; that is, contrary to what the New Testament says he would teach. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth." "That wicked one, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

My opponents do not profess to know much about the Bible, or what PAX calls the Testament. They seem better acquainted with profane poetry, and the ridiculous bombast of Counsellor Phillips; but I shall suppose them sitting down to make a commentary on the above extract from the New Testament. They would likely find, in the *first* place, that the latter times meant the period of the Reformation; and, *secondly*, That those who gave heed to seducing spirits were Luther and his colleagues. But how could they find Luther forbidding to marry, when one of the greatest crimes of which they accuse him is, that he did marry? How could they find the Reformers commanding to abstain from meats, when they accuse them (at least Luther) of ceasing to give himself up to *fasting*, watching, and prayer?

The truth is, and it is vain to deny it, the above extract from the New Testament, dictated by the Spirit of prophecy, points out with historical accuracy, the character and practice of the Church of Rome. She departed from the faith when she let go

the sole and exclusive authority of Christ in matters of faith, and took for her rule the traditions and authority of men. She gave heed to seducing spirits, when she received for infallible truth the absurd reveries of wild and senseless children, under the name of Fathers and Saints. She gave heed to doctrines of devils, that is, concerning demons or departed spirits, when she taught the worship of saints, as the heathens worshipped their departed heroes. She forbade her priests to marry, but gave them permission to live in all manner of lewdness. In this article alone the wickedness of the Church of Rome appears great beyond expression. She makes that unlawful which God has declared to be lawful and honourable; and she gives permission to her priests, who ought to be examples to the people, of sobriety and purity, to live in open violation of one of the precepts of the decalogue. The same remark applies to her commanding to abstain from meats. God has provided suitable food for all his creatures, and he gives men permission to eat of whatever is fit to be eaten; but Papists, affecting to be more holy than is required of them, and pretending to imitate Christ's fast of forty days, abstain from eating flesh in Lent. They imitate Christ in nothing that is imitable; and they profess to imitate him in that which is inimitable.

Speaking lies in hypocrisy, with signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, are prominent features of that system which practised all the arts of jugglery to deceive the people, and keep them in subjection to their ghostly fathers. I shall conclude this paper with a specimen of their lying wonders; and let the reader judge if it be possible that a system, supported by means of such absurdity and impiety, can be any thing but the very opposite of Christianity.

"The Sovereign Queen of Heaven," says one of their books of devotion, "not only cherishes affectionately her servants; ennobles them with singular prerogatives; succours them in their necessities, and espouses their causes; but she also saves them by her prayers from deserved punishment, and introduces them into the kingdom of heaven. Of all these prerogatives, this last appears to be the most singular and worthy of admiration; for it is a thing very strange, that, according to the common opinion of doctors, none of those who live and die her servants can, by any means whatever, be damned. Yea, even many of them who are wicked and abandoned, as daily experience shows, have miraculously obtained mercy and eternal life."

I can easily believe, that many of the devoted servants of the Virgin Mary might be found, by daily experience, to be wicked and abandoned; but it does not appear so clearly, how daily experience could show, that many of these had, by her means, ob-

tained mercy and eternal life. It is not likely that such cases as the following occurred every day:—

“ St. Anselm records, that a famous robber entered one morning into the cottage of a poor widow with an intention of robbing her: but, judging her unworthy of his rapine, he began to accost her in a familiar and merry strain:—And have you breakfasted yet my good woman? I breakfast, Sir! said she; God forbid that I should so violate the vow I have made to fast every Saturday of the year. Every Saturday! and why that? replied he. Because, answered the widow, I have heard from a preacher, very famous in doctrine, and still more so from the sanctity of his life, that whoever fasts on Saturday, in honour of our Lady, cannot die without confession. The robber, at these words, felt compunction, fell down on his knees, and promised and swore to the Queen of Angels to fast every Saturday too; which promise he kept inviolably ever after. But, as he still continued his robberies, he was one day surprised by some travellers, who, by a stroke of a sword, separated his head from his body. His executioners, thinking they had done his business sufficiently, withdrew from him a few steps: when lo! the head of him that was killed fell a crying, Confession, masters, I beg that at least I may have confession. After they had a little recovered from the astonishment and panic, which such a prodigy caused, they ran to the next village to advertise the curate, who immediately came, accompanied by a great number of his parishioners, desirous of beholding the miracle; and, having joined the head of the robber to his body, gave him confession as he desired. That being done, the penitent having thanked him for his good office, said to him, with a voice so distinct and high as to be easily heard by all present, Masters, I never did any good thing in all my lifetime, except my having fasted every Saturday, in honour of the Mother of God. In the very instant I received the deadly blow, a frightful troop of devils surrounded me, for to seize my soul: but the Blessed Virgin coming to my aid, she drove these forthwith far from me by her divine presence, and would not suffer my soul to leave my body till I should be sufficiently contrite, and make confession of my sins. He spoke thus, and having entreated the attendants to pray for him, he passed from this life into one more happy and glorious.” *See Free Thoughts, &c. with the authorities cited.* Such, it seems, is the religion of those who make an outcry against the doctrine of salvation by faith, without good works; that they can save the greatest criminals without either faith or works, if they will only fast on Saturday in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

THE

Protestant,

No. IV.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 8th, 1818.

“IF,” says PAX, “a Pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed, and the followers of the Ex-Pope would then, and only then, be called Papists.” In my last number I have shown that the Church of Rome taught many things contrary to what is contained in the New Testament; and supposing the Pope to preach any thing at all, we may suppose he will preach the doctrines of his Church. For instance; the New Testament affirms, that marriage is honourable in *all*; but no, says the Pope, it is not honourable in all,—it is not even lawful in the clergy. We are taught in the New Testament that none can forgive sins but God, agreeably to his own declaration in the Old Testament:—“I, even I, am he that pardoneth thine iniquities for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins any more:” but the Pope teaches that this is not true; he says he can forgive sins himself, and that all his Priests can do the same. Why then is he not deposed? If what PAX says were true, there never would have been a Pope; for there never was one who did not teach doctrines contrary to the New Testament. Nay, his very existence as a ruler over the Church is in direct opposition to the New Testament. While he pretends to be the successor of Peter, and to sit in the chair of Peter, his whole administration is opposed to the injunctions of that Apostle, who, in the name of his divine Master, charges all the ministers of Christ not to assume authority over their brethren. “Feed the flock of God,” says he, “that is among you, taking the oversight

thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being *lords over God's heritage*, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Pet. v. 2, 3. The Spirit of God foresaw what should happen, and he put in this caveat against it. If there be any thing in the history of human depravity, contrary to the will God, as revealed in the Scriptures, it is the authority assumed, and the power exercised by the Pope of Rome. Blinded, indeed, must that man be who does not see this; and he must be ignorant indeed who can maintain, that if such were the case the Pope would be deposed.

Will PAX tell me who could depose him? All the authority in the Church of Rome has centered in him for hundreds of years. There is, indeed, no authority in the Church but his. The Pope told King Richard, that "he held the place of God upon earth; and, without distinction of persons, he would punish the men and the nations that presume to oppose his commands." Martin V., in the instructions given to a Nuncio sent to Constantinople, assumes to himself the following blasphemous title: "The most Holy and most Blessed, who is invested with Heavenly power, who is Lord on earth, the successor of Peter, the Christ or anointed of the Lord, the Lord of the Universe, the Father of Kings, the Light of the World, the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Martin." The Pope does not indeed talk in such language now; but his claims are still sufficiently high, and the submission yielded to him is such, that to speak of his being deposed, is as absurd as to speak of the head cutting itself off. He was, at one time, indeed, and very lately, not far from being cut off or deposed; not however, by his own authority, or by the authority of the Church, but by the power of the French Emperor. Then, he who affects to have all power in heaven and earth (as the Popes blasphemously do), was content to hold his station and authority at the will of an Upstart and a Usurper. He was even mean enough to become the tool of that Usurper, and to yield the sanction of his then little authority to his nefarious deeds.

The following is the doctrine which was taught throughout all France by his authority:—"Q. What are the duties of Christians towards the Princes who govern them; and what are our duties towards our Emperor, Napoleon the First? A. Christians owe to the Princes who govern them, and we owe in particular to our Emperor, Napoleon the First, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, the contributions required for the preservation and defence of the Empire and of his throne; we, moreover, owe to him our fervent prayers for his welfare, and for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the State." In answer to another question it is said of this Emperor:—"It is he

whom God raised up in difficult circumstances to re-establish the public worship of the religion of our forefathers, and to be its protector. He has restored and preserved public order by his profound and active wisdom; he defends the state by his mighty arm; he has become the *anointed* of the Lord by the consecration which he received from the Sovereign Pontiff, the Head of the Universal Church." "Q. What are we to think of those who violate their duty towards our Emperor? A. According to the Apostle Paul, they would resist the order established by God himself, and render themselves worthy of *eternal damnation*." *Catechism for the use of the French Church.*

Papists, and AMICUS VERITATIS in particular, rail against the Reformers for disloyalty; but, allowing all they say on that subject to be true, which is by no means the case, it is not to be compared with the conduct of the present Pope towards Bonaparte. Believing, as Papists in general do, the divine indefeasible right of Kings, and particularly of the Bourbons, the Pope was guilty of rebellion against that divine authority, when he crowned the Usurper, and blessed him as his beloved Son. It is needless to tell me that he whipt himself heartily for this afterwards. Such a crime required greater satisfaction than a few stripes inflicted by his own hand.

Papists will plead the necessity of the case; they will say the Holy Father was compelled to do as he did; and it is one of the evils of the Popish system, that it accommodates itself to circumstances, and times, and places: thus Papists in Great Britain submit to many things, and profess many things, which they would not do if they were living in Spain or Italy. They will profess, or deny, or do any thing that will serve the purpose of preserving or promoting the interests of the Holy See. Thus the Pope found it necessary to submit to Bonaparte, and to do as he bade him. The thing was wrong to be sure, but the necessity of the case made it right. If this principle were universally acted upon, there would be no such thing as morality in the world; there would be nothing to oppose that which is evil. Real Christianity teaches a different lesson—that it is not lawful on *any account* to do evil; and it is not in the power of any creature, or of all creatures together, to compel a man to do evil. But Popery in this, as in every thing else, is opposed to Christianity. Real Christians will rather die than commit sin, at least it is the will of God that they should do so; but the head of the Romish Church can not only permit evil to be done, but he sets the example by doing it himself.

PAX affirms, that "there are, in every Christian, some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion on them, with those

whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would appear to me a sinful provocation." The latter part of this sentence does not apply to me, though, I suppose, PAX means it so. It is not,—it never was my practice, much less my boast, to treat every sentiment and opinion not my own with contempt. In matters of religion I profess no opinions that are properly my own; and if PAX, or any body else, shall convict me of sporting my own opinions, or any opinions but what are clearly derived from the Word of God, I shall thank him for his pains, and give him liberty to treat said opinions with as much contempt as he pleases.

That "there are in every Christian some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms," as not to be fit subjects of discussion, is what I cannot admit. PAX is not commissioned to speak in name of every Christian more than I am. It may be true of Papists, that they have such secret and sacred points of faith as must not be told to every body,—as must not be the subject of discussion, or even of defence when they are impugned. But this is not the case with the faith of a Christian. He has nothing so delicately refined, or so sacredly planted in his bosom, that he may not tell it to all the world; nay, he is commanded by the Author and Finisher of his faith to proclaim it, if he have opportunity, upon the house-tops—to make it known to every creature.

The faith of a Christian is, That God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; that we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of his grace. The sum of the whole is, that we are sinners; that Christ came into the world to save sinners; that he gave his life a ransom for many; that he is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him; and that he that believeth on him shall be saved. This possesses all the pathos and sublimity of divine truth; but it is not a delicately refined sentiment planted in the human breast, for the purpose of being concealed there. Christians are commanded to be ready to give an answer to every one that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them; and to profess their faith before the world. There must be something wrong—there must be some radical error in that system of faith that is so refined, and so hallowed, and so sacredly planted in the bosom, as to be locked up in it, and to be unfit for discussion.

I am aware that PAX is referring to the doctrine of transubstantiation. I have oftener than once accused Papists of main-

taining the monstrous absurdity, that a priest can create his own Creator; that is, that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. This is the point of faith so delicately refined, planted in his bosom, that to encourage a discussion of it would be sinful provocation. Accordingly, neither he nor his friend A. V. has made any reply to the above charge. They have attempted to answer many things of far less importance; but while they do not deny that they maintain this absurd doctrine, they have not the candour to confess that they do maintain it. I must, therefore, have recourse again to the Douay Catechism, which A. V. acknowledges to be of supreme authority, being approved by the whole church.

“Q. What is the blessed Eucharist? A. It is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.—Q. What is there under the form of bread? A. There is not only the body, but also the blood of Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ also under the form of wine? Yes.—Q. What else? A. There are also under each form the soul and divinity of Christ; so that under the form of bread there are the body and blood, the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely, and the same under the form of wine.—Q. In what manner is Christ present in the Eucharist? A. By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as heretics would have it.—Q. How prove you that? A. Because when Christ ordained it at his last supper, he took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *This is my body*; and he also blessed the cup, saying, *This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins*. Mat. xxvi. 28.—Q. By what means is that which was before bread changed into the body of Christ, and that which was wine changed into the blood of Christ? A. By the divine power, which as easily changes one substance into another, as he made the world out of nothing, and works the miraculous effect which the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation, by the ministry of the priest; in the same manner as when by Moses the rivers were changed into blood, and water into wine by our Saviour Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ hurt or broken when we divide or break the sacrament? A. No, it is not; for Christ is now immortal and impassible, he cannot die or suffer any more. Rom. vi. 9.—Q. How can the same thing be in many places at once? A. By the omnipotence of God, to whom nothing is impossible; who is in all and every one of his creatures at one and the same time, and daily works such wonders even in nature as surpass our understanding.—Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. Wheaten

bread, and wine of the grape.—Q. What is the form of it? A. This is my body, this is my blood.—Q. What disposition is required in him that receives the blessed Eucharist? A. That he be in the state of grace, free from all mortal sin: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. 1 Cor. xi. 29.—Q. Is it lawful or profitable to receive under one kind? A. Yes, because under one kind we receive both body and blood.—Q. Did not Christ command all to receive under both kinds? A. No; for at the last supper, when he bid all present then drink of the cup, none were there but the Apostles. And, when in St. John, c. vi. he seems to command the receiving under both kinds, he immediately takes away the difficulty, by promising everlasting life to him that receives under the form of bread alone. He that eats this bread shall live for ever, v. 58.—Q. What are the effects of this sacrament? A. It increases grace, and nourishes our souls in spiritual life. He that eats of this bread shall live for ever, John vi. 58.—Q. Is the Eucharist a sacrament only? A. No; it is also a sacrifice.” The Catechism then proceeds to illustrate the doctrine contained in this answer, the sacrifice of the mass, &c. to which I may advert in a future Number.

The doctrine clearly maintained in the above extract is, that bread and wine are, by the power of God, and by the ministry of the priest, changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. My readers will probably think the statement here is sufficiently gross: yet the Douay Catechism does not go the full length of absurdity that some others do. I should say my copy; for I have been informed there are different versions of the Douay Catechism, intended for different parts of the world, adapted to the different degrees of knowledge or ignorance that may exist among the people. Other catechisms, therefore, may be still more absurd than my version of the Douay one. I have before me two volumes of a catechism in French, entitled, “*Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme; imprimées par ordre de Messire Charles Joachim Colbert, Eveque de Montpellier, 1719.*” This Catechism asserts, that the bread and wine are not bread and wine after the consecration. They retain nothing but the appearance, to wit, the colour, the figure, and the taste. “*Il n’y a plus ni pain ni vin; il n’en reste que les apparences; scavoir, la couleur, la figure, et la goût. La substance du pain est changée en la substance du corps de Jesus Christ, et la substance du vin est changée en la substance du sang de Jesus Christ.*”

With intelligent persons the mere statement of such a doctrine is sufficient confutation; but as Papists profess to give scripture authority for it, a few observations may be allowed. Their prin-

cial argument is derived from the words of Christ, at the institution of the Lord's supper, which they call the Eucharist, or thanksgiving. The words of the Vulgate, which with Papists is of equal authority with the original Greek, are, *hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body. Plain common sense can see in this nothing more than this represents, or signifies my body; as when Christ figuratively speaks of himself as "the door," "the true vine," &c. nobody supposes that he was really transformed, or transubstantiated into a door or a vine. But the words of the Vulgate are not the words of Christ, for he did not speak in the Latin language. "Had he spoken in Latin," says Dr. Clarke, "following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said *panis hic corpus meum significat*; or, *symbolum est corporis mei—hoc poculum sanguinem meum representat*; or, *symbolum est sanguinis mei*: this bread *signifies* my body; this cup *represents* my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean*, *signify*, *denote*, though both the Greek and Latin abound with them: hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say, *it is*, for *it signifies*. So Gen. xli. 26, 27. *The seven kine ARE* (i. e. represent) seven years. And, following the Hebrew idiom, though the work is written in Greek, we find in Rev. i. 20, "the seven stars *ARE* (*represent*) the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks *ARE* (*represent*) the seven churches."—*Discourse on the Nature, Design, and Institution of the Eucharist*, p. 51. What absurdities one should make the Bible speak, if every passage in which the substantive verb is used were to be understood as Papists affect to understand "this *is* my body!"

The transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is compared to the miracle of Moses, when he changed the rivers into blood; and that of Christ, when he changed the water into wine. But the cases are by no means parallel. The change produced by these miracles was evident to the senses of those who witnessed them. They did not change the substance, and retain the same appearance as before. After the water was changed into blood in the one case, and into wine in the other, the colour and the taste were not those of water; but the change which is pretended to be made by the ministry of the priest, when he uses certain words, leaves every thing as it was. The acutest sense, whether of seeing, handling, tasting, or smelling, can perceive no difference: yet the people are taught to believe that a mysterious change of the whole substance has taken place; that what they know was bread a few seconds before, and what they see to be bread still, is not bread, but the real body of Christ, which they are told at the same time is in heaven. The tendency of this monstrous absurdity is to set

aside the evidence of miracles altogether; for the senses of men were always called to judge of a miracle; but transubstantiation completely sets aside the evidence of sense; and if this doctrine were true, we have no certainty of any thing that Christ and his Apostles did in order to convince men that the power of God was with them. If the senses of thousands be deceived every time the Eucharist is celebrated, they may have been deceived also with regard to every miracle recorded in Scripture.*

But the wickedness of the doctrine does not terminate here. Along with the body and blood, there is also the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely under the form of bread, and the same under the form of wine. The priest professes to change a little gross matter into an object of worship—into the *divinity*, as well as into the soul and body of the Saviour; then he falls down and worships the work of his own hands; he holds it up to be adored by the whole congregation; and having worshipped the idol they eat it up! The grossest heathenism is scarcely to be compared with this. This is Popery as it exists and is practised at this day, amidst all the light of science, and all the light which the Word of God has shed upon our Christian population! One should think this a subject too serious for burlesque, and yet Papists themselves can burlesque it. “I had a mind to see,” says Bishop Burnet, “a picture that, as I was told, is over one of the Popish altars in Worms, which one would think was invented by the enemies of transubstantiation, to make it appear ridiculous. There is a wind-mill, and the Virgin throws Christ into the hopper, and he comes out at the eye of the mill all in wafers, which some priests take up to give to the people.”—*Letters, &c. let. 5th, quoted in Free Thoughts, &c.* p. 387.

Much has been said about the priests withholding the wine from the people, and taking it all to themselves. I think the people would sustain no loss though the bread were also withheld, and though the priests ate and drank the whole idol. The service is a piece of profane mummary—an impious imitation of a holy ordinance; and the less it is made to resemble the divine original the better.

* See Mr. Burns' excellent Letter to Dr. Chalmers.

THE

Protestant,

No. V.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 15th, 1818.

PAX says, if I had taxed the Catholics with any one principle which they profess, he would gladly have acknowledged it. I have taxed them with many things which they profess, if their own words and their own Catechism express their profession; and I hear of no acknowledgment coming from PAX or any of his brethren. I taxed them plainly with transubstantiation. This is certainly a doctrine which Papists profess; yet PAX does not acknowledge it. It is a point of "faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted" in his bosom, that he must not say any thing about it to provoke discussion.

"He (the PROTESTANT) asserts," says PAX, "the Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible; they believe him to be the head of the Church; but they know him to be a man, and not their God, as he contemptuously asserts." Perhaps PAX means it to be understood, by this sentence, that he does not believe in the Pope's infallibility; but he does not say so. He represents me as asserting that Catholics believe it; and Protestants may understand that he repels this charge; but if any thorough-bred Papist should find fault with him for denying the Pope's infallibility, he can say he did not deny it; he only said that the PROTESTANT asserted that Catholics believed it, which is certainly true.

PAX must know very well that this assertion is strictly correct. Papists do believe the Pope to be infallible. I do not say that *all* Papists believe it; for I know that while the Romish Church has for many centuries maintained the doctrine of infallibility, her

members were never agreed with regard to the seat of it. Some held that it was in a general council; some ascribed it to the Pope; and others to the Pope and a general council together; which led Dean Swift to remark, that the church might as well be without an infallible head, as not to know where to find him in a time or necessity.

If there can be any thing rational in absurdity and impiety, I should maintain that the opinion of those who believe the Pope to be infallible, is the most rational of the three. A general council is composed of hundreds of individuals, who are all allowed to be fallible men when taken separately; and it is impossible to conceive that a hundred fallible men can make an infallible body; as well might we suppose that a hundred lies will make one truth. To add the Pope to a general council, and make the two together infallible, is little better; it is still a compound of fallible materials; and amidst the jarring opinions of many fallible individuals, it is scarcely possible to come to any decision, without appealing to *one* as the ultimate judge. In point of fact, this one was the Pope; and whatever persons might maintain as a speculative opinion, with regard to the seat of infallibility, which all believed to be somewhere in the church, for all practical purposes it was generally understood to rest with the Pope.

And if it be true that the Pope is the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ; that he has all the authority with which Christ invested Peter as one of his accredited ambassadors; nay more, if it be true that he is the head of the Church (as PAX asserts), which Peter never pretended to be;—then, without all doubt, if he be not infallible, he ought to be so; and he ought to be omniscient too; he ought to be able to search the reins and the heart, that he may give to every man according to his works. In short, it is a very cruel thing to make any man the head of the church, if he be not infallible, for without this he will commit great mistakes, which will issue in the ruin of himself and others.

I shall now proceed to give the opinion of Popish writers on the subject of the Pope's infallibility. It is maintained, in the decretals, that the Pope can be judged by none—that his judgment, whether respecting faith, manners, or discipline, ought to be preferred to all things, (not excepting even the Bible, it seems); “that nothing is true except what he approves, and every thing which he condemns is false.” “We can believe nothing,” says Lewis Capsensis, “unless we believe, with a divine faith, that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, and infallible.” “It depends upon the Pope,” says Baronius, “to ratify decrees, and to alter them when ratified.” “The Pope,” says Bellarmine, “is absolutely above the Catholic Church, and above a general

council; so that he has no judge above him on earth.”—See *McCulloch's Popery Condemned, with the references*, p. 150, 151.

Bellarmino teaches, “that the Pope, when he instructs the whole church in things concerning faith, cannot possibly err; and whether he be heretic himself or not, he can by no means define any thing heretical to be believed by the whole church.” Another writer on this subject says, “The very doubt whether a council be greater than the Pope seems to be absurd, because it would involve a contradiction, namely, that the supreme Pontiff is not supreme.”—“He cannot err, he cannot be deceived,” says another, “it must be conceived concerning him, that he knows all things.” “O Rome,” exclaims Cornelius Mussus, bishop of Bitonto, “to whom shall we go for divine counsels, unless to those persons to whose trust the dispensation of the divine mysteries has been committed? We are therefore to hear him who is to us instead of God, in things that concern God, as God himself. For my part, I freely confess, in things that belong to the mysteries of faith, I had rather believe one Pope than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, Gregories, not to speak of Richards, Scotuses, and Williamses: for I believe and *know* that the Pope cannot err in matters of faith, because the authority and right of determining whatever relates to faith resides in the Pope.” The Assembly of Cardinals, Prelates, and Clergy of France, 1625, declare, “that his Holiness is above the reach of calumny, and his faith out of the reach of error.” In the theses of the Jesuits, in the College of Claremont, it was maintained, “that Christ hath so committed the government of his church to the Popes, that he hath conferred on them the same infallibility which he had himself, as often as they speak *ex cathedra*; and therefore there is in the Church of Rome an infallible judge of controversies of faith, even without a general council, whether in matters of right or fact.” The learned writer of “*Free Thoughts*,” from whose notes these extracts are taken, and who gives a host of authorities, asserts that the above has been the general doctrine of the Jesuits, though violently opposed by the Jansenists, and a great part of the Gallican Church. Three or four councils have ascribed infallibility to the Pope, particularly that of Florence, under Pope Eugene, in opposition to the decisions of the council of Basil. The last council of Lateran, and that of Trent, may also, with good reason, be reckoned to have acknowledged this. But at the time of the last of these, the Pope declared, that he would rather shed his blood than part with his rights, which had been established upon the doctrine of the Church, and the blood of martyrs: and the legates were charged not to allow the council to make any decision on the point of infallibility, and

they accordingly avowed they would rather lose their life than allow a thing so certain to be called in question. The bishop of Grenada maintained before the council, that the Pope was a God on earth, and therefore he was not subject to a council." *Free Thoughts*, p. 200. PAX will see from this, that I was not mistaken when I called the Pope the god of Papists.

I do not suppose that Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV. was a divine of high authority in the Church of Rome; but he possessed the genuine spirit of a bigotted Papist. He believed it lawful for any private person to kill the king, because he was too favourable to the heretics, and because he had been told that he intended to make war on the Pope; "*and to make war against the Pope,*" said Ravaillac to his judges, "*is to make war against God, seeing the Pope is God, and God is the Pope.*" Such language as this was encouraged in the Church of Rome, at least no fault was found with it; the Church itself, therefore, is implicated in the crime; for every church ought to be held responsible for the opinions and practices of her members, when they are not publicly disapproved or disavowed.

Bellarmino is allowed by Papists themselves, to be a standard authority in their Church. What gives his testimony double force is, that he was a counsellor of the court of Rome, wrote under the Pope's eye, and taught controversy publicly in his university; and his books were published in Rome itself, and dedicated to the reigning Pope; and instead of meeting with the smallest censure from that court, they were received with the highest approbation, and the dignity of cardinal conferred on him as a reward of his merit. Now, such was the devotion of this Bellarmine to the Church of Rome, and such were his ideas of the infallibility of the Pope, that he taught as follows: "He thinks not rightly of the Church of Christ, who admits nothing but what he finds to be written, or done, in the ancient church; as if the church in latter times either ceased to be the church, or had not a power of explaining and declaring, appointing, and even commanding whatever relates to faith and manners."—"It may be affirmed, in a good sense," says he, "that Christ gave to Peter the power of making sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin." And again, "If the Pope should command vice, and prohibit virtue, the Church would be bound to believe vice to be good, and virtue to be evil, unless she should sin against conscience." The canons, with their glossaries, teach that the Pope "hath a heavenly power, *cæleste arbitrium*, and therefore changes the nature of things, applying the essential attributes of the one to the other; that he can make something of nothing; and in those things that he wills, his will is instead of reason; nor is there any one that can say to him, *What dost thou?* for he

can dispense with law; he can make justice injustice, by changing and correcting laws; and, in a word, that he hath a plenitude of power.

The Popes have often been accused of putting themselves on a footing with Jesus Christ, as of equal authority with him; but this, impious as it is, comes short of the truth. The Pope actually exalts himself *above* all that is called God. He assumes greater power; and his minions, such as Bellarmine, ascribe to him greater power than ever was ascribed to Jesus Christ. It was never said of the Saviour that he did, or that he could make that which is sin to be no sin, or that he could make that to be no sin which is sin. The law of God, the eternal and immutable law of righteousness, was in his heart. He obeyed every precept of it himself; and he made atonement for every transgression in the room of all his people. But had it been possible for any power in heaven or on earth to make that which is sin to be no sin, there was no occasion for either the obedience or the atonement of Christ. When I speak of what divine power cannot do, I must, of course, be understood as speaking of those things which are contrary to the infinite holiness of God. It derogates nothing from any of the divine perfections, nay, it is the glory of the character of God, that he cannot lie, that he cannot look upon iniquity. He cannot, therefore, make that which is sin to be no sin. But Bellarmine, an approved doctor in the Romish Church, says the Pope can do so. This accounts for the fact of my opponents pertinaciously maintaining that it never was a principle of their Church, that a Pope would grant indulgence or permission to commit sin, for that cannot be sin, be it murder or any thing else, which the Pope grants permission to do.

It was quite usual with Popish writers to address the Pope as a God; and instead of finding fault with any of them for this impiety, he received their adulation as the sweetest incense. Angelus Politianus thus addresses Alexander VI. "We rejoice to see you raised above all human things, and exalted even to divinity itself, seeing there is nothing, except God, which is not put under you." And Clement VII., with his cardinals of Avignon, writing to King Charles VI. says, "As there is but one God in the heavens, so there cannot, nor ought to be of right but one God on earth." *Troisard, tom. 3. fol. 147.* "It is evident," says the canon law, "that the Pope who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power; for it is manifest that a God cannot be judged by men." See *Free Thoughts, &c. with the references, p. 32, 33.*

One should think it scarcely possible to go farther in impiety and blasphemy; yet, the following seems to exceed any thing of the

kind which I have seen. The devil hath passed so far in this mystery of iniquity, that one disputed in the schools a little before Luther came, and somewhat after, whether the Pope participated not in both natures, the divine and human, with Jesus Christ." Page 275, *Du Piessis*, who refers, on the margin, to *Erasmus, in Epist. 2d Tim. cap. 1*. The Church of Rome has, perhaps, to thank the Reformation, and the light which accompanied it, for checking this error, so that it went no further than the schools. But for this, it would very likely have found its way into some of the public standards of the Church; and the Pope, frail and mortal as he was, would have accepted the compliment of possessing the divine as well as the human nature.

It is well known that the Pope claimed authority, not only over the Church, but also over all the civil powers in Christendom; nay, he pretended that the property of the whole globe was vested in him, so that he could dispose of islands and continents at his pleasure. It is said, that some of the Papists in Ireland have of late begun to doubt his infallibility, because he gave that kingdom to England; but if he could by any means give England to Ireland, I doubt not he would be, in the esteem of Irish Papists, as infallible as ever. "It is a thing most manifest," says a Popish writer, "that his Holiness hath universal power over all, not only in his own states, and over his own vassals, but also in those of other princes, and in all the world; but as to the laity, the jurisdiction is of two sorts, spiritual and temporal; as to the spiritual, every one grants that he hath supreme power as head. Considering, therefore, those things that are of positive institution (*de jure positivo*), his Holiness can not only interpret, and dispense with them, but he can revoke them entirely. It is not quite the same with such as are of *jure divino*; these he cannot revoke, he can only explain." *Tesoro Politico, con licenza de superiori*, 1602. p. 20. Bellarmine teaches that "the Pope has the chief power of disposing of the temporal affairs of all Christians, in order to their spiritual good." *Lib. V. cap. 6*. "And on account of the wickedness of the times, not only usefully, but even necessarily, some temporal principalities are granted to the Pope and to the other bishops." *Lib. V. cap. 9*. "It would be altogether expedient, if it could be brought to pass without injustice and warlike strife, that all the provinces of the world were ruled, even in political matters, by one chief king." *Lib. I. cap. 9*. "It is not repugnant to the gospel, if in any manner it might be, that the same should be high priest of the whole world, and also emperor of the whole world." *Lib. V. cap. 10*. It would seem as if the Pope had nothing less than this in view, and that he was actually grasping at the

empire of the whole world, when his hand was paralyzed by the Reformation.

I could easily show from a work above quoted (*Tesoro Politico*) numerous authentic instances of princes holding their dominions under the Pope, who claimed a right to dispose of them at his pleasure. Indeed, to deny that the Pope had such power, was declared to be heresy. Thus BONIFACE addresses a letter to Philip le Bel, in these terms, "Boniface, Bishop, and servant of the servants of God, to Philip, king of France: fear God and keep his commandments: we would have you to know that you are subject to us, both in things spiritual and temporal, and we declare all those to be heretics who believe the contrary. Given at our palace of Lateran, the 5th of December, the 7th year of our Pontificate." In another to the same, he says, "God hath established us over kings and kingdoms, to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant, in his name, and by his doctrine. Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that you have not a superior, and that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; he that thinks thus is a fool; and he that obstinately maintains it is an infidel, separated from the flock of the good Shepherd."

The Pope thus being acknowledged to have all power on earth, was not yet content. He must have power in heaven too; he professed to open and shut its gates at his pleasure; and he impiously pretended to have the heavenly powers at his command, though only for the purpose of gratifying his own avarice and revenge. The Pope was the proprietor of some alum works; for the holy father, it seems, could condescend to be a chemist and a manufacturer. One of the workmen made his elopement, came to Britain, and revealed the secrets of the trade. The Pope sent after him the following curses in the form of an excommunication, which my readers may contrast with the doctrines of Jesus Christ. *Bless and curse not.*

"By the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and of the holy canons; and of the immaculate Virgin Mary, the mother and patroness of our Saviour; and of all the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims, and seraphims; and of all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; of the holy martyrs and holy confessors; and of the holy virgins, and of all the saints, together with all the holy elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize this thief, or this malefactor, N——: and from the thresholds of the holy church of Almighty God, we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed, and delivered over, with Dathan and Abiram, and with

nose who say unto the Lord God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways; and as fire is quenched with water, so let his light be put out for ever, unless he shall repent and make satisfaction. Amen.

“ May God the Father, who created man, curse him. May God the Son, who suffered for us, curse him. May the Holy Ghost, who was given to us in baptism, curse him. May the holy cross, which Christ for our salvation triumphantly ascended, curse him. May the holy and eternal Virgin Mary curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May St. John, the chief forerunner and baptist of Christ, curse him. May St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all the other apostles of Christ, together with the rest of his disciples, and the four evangelists, curse him. May the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who, by their holy works, are found pleasing to God, curse him. May the holy choir of the holy virgins, who, for the honour of Christ, have despised the things of this world, curse him. May all the saints, who, from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages, are found to be the beloved of God, curse him. May the heaven and the earth, and all things therein remaining, curse him. May he be cursed wherever he may be, whether in the house or in the field, in the highway or in the path, in the wood or in the water, or in the church. May he be cursed in living, in dying, in eating, in drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in waking, in walking, in standing, in sitting, in lying, in working, in resting,”—[I must omit some words, for the Pope is far mote gross than Luther, see No. II.] —“ and in blood-letting. May he be cursed in all the powers of his body. May he be cursed within and without. May he be cursed in the hair of his head. May he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eye-brows, in his cheeks, in his jaw-bones, in his nostrils, in his fore-teeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his wrists, in his arms, in his hands, in his breast, and in all the interior parts of the very stomach, in his reins, in his groin, in his thighs,”————“ in his hips, in his knees, in his legs, in his feet, in his joints, and in his nails. May he be cursed in the whole structure of his members. From the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him. And may heaven and all the powers that move therein, rise against him to damn him, unless he repent and make full satisfaction. Amen. Amen. Amen.” *Ledger Book of the Church of Rochester, and Sir Henry Spelman’s Glossary, p. 206. Quoted by both Bruce and McCulloch*

THE

Protestant,

No. VI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22d, 1818.

It is impossible to enumerate, in one Paper or two, the absurdities involved in this article of the Popish creed,—“ We believe the Pope to be the Head of the Church.” It is absurd and impious enough for a man to profess to be head of any Christian church, though it be so small as to be actually within the sphere of his personal oversight. It is worse to pretend to be head of the Church in a whole diocese, or nation, to which one man cannot possibly do the duty of a bishop or overseer; but to pretend to be head of the Catholic or Universal Church, is, beyond expression, impious and absurd. Such, however, is the avowed belief of PAX; and he speaks for his brethren as well as himself, for he says, “ they believe him (*i. e.* the Pope) to be the head of the Church;” and it is of the Catholic, or Universal Church, that he is speaking.

In my last Number, I gave a sketch of the Pope’s claims to infallibility, and universal authority over all things, and all persons, with regard to both spiritual and temporal matters; and if he were really the head of the Christian Church, such authority and power would not be too much for him; he would require it all, in order to conduct the affairs of the Church, and to defend her against her enemies. Nay more, as the greatest enemies of the Church are not fellow-creatures, but principalities, and powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this world, if the Pope were the head of the Church, he would require to have greater power than these, else the Church would soon be overcome,—the gates of hell would soon prevail against it. The real head of the Church has such power; and because he has it, we rest assured of the safety of the Church throughout all ages. Christ says

truly, and he only can say it, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." God "raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all might, and dominion, and principality, and power, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

The head of the Church is represented as sitting upon a throne of glory; thousands of holy angels minister to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him; he employs them in the service of his Church; they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who are the heirs of salvation; and they acknowledge themselves to be the fellow servants, and the brethren of them who have the testimony of Jesus. Nay, they are a constituent part of the Church of Christ; not that part, indeed, which he purchased with his own blood; but they are a part of that great assembly which surround the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple.

With all this power Jesus Christ is invested; and it is all necessary to his being the head of the Church. But who was ever the Pope that possessed such power, or that could exhibit such glory? The Pope, indeed, pretends to it; but the pretence is as vain and impious as was the pretence of Baal to be the God of Israel; and the priests of the one idol may very justly be compared with those of the other, as zealous supporters of that system of idolatrous worship, which is as much opposed to Christianity, as was the worship of Baal, or of the golden calves, to the worship of the true God.

The Pope affects to be like Jesus Christ. He has also his throne, and his attending worshippers, who fall down before him, and kiss his feet*. He cannot, indeed, make the winds his messengers. He cannot send lightnings that they may go, nor do they say unto him, Here we are. But he has his Bulls, which he sends throughout the world, and his legates, *a latere*, who stand at his elbow, waiting his commands, and who go forth from his presence to do his will throughout all his dominion,—to rule the hearts and consciences of men; to order all their spiritual concerns; to pardon or retain their sins; to save or condemn their souls;

* It is recorded, as an instance of singular humility in one of the Popes, that he had a cross embroidered on his slipper, that it might appear to be the cross, and not his foot, that was worshipped by the prostrate devotee.

or, to use his own language, "to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant." All this is pretended by a poor dying worm.—While it is unspeakably impious, it is infinitely more ridiculous than children playing at kings and queens. It is a creature affecting the style, and majesty, and authority, and power, of the Creator.

I shall be told, perhaps, that it is only the Church on earth of which the Pope is the head, and that, as it is composed of mere men and women, there is nothing more unreasonable in one man being constituted the head of such a body, than in one man being constituted the head of a state or nation. The cases are by no means parallel. Human laws and human government are proper and necessary for human creatures; a mere creature, like ourselves, may be constituted the head of a kingdom; and his authority and power may be sufficient for all the purposes of the constitution. But the Church, even in this world, is a congregation of faithful men, that is, believing men, who, as such, are renewed in the spirit of their minds, are united to Jesus Christ in the most intimate relation*, and to the saints in heaven, so as to form, with them, one body, of which Christ is the head. I use the word congregation, not as denoting a visible assembly, for this Church never can come together in this world; but though not visibly, they are really gathered together as one in Christ.

This is a society of spiritual men. They are separated from the world for spiritual purposes. When companies of them come together as a visible organized Church, be they ever so few, or ever so many, it is for the purpose of serving God in the way which he has appointed, in which he has promised to accept their service,—to promote the edification of themselves and one another,—and to propagate the gospel in the world. This society is divine in its origin, in its constitution, in its laws, and these laws are administered under the sanction of divine authority.

No mere creature is capable of being the head of such a body, because he is incapable of taking cognizance of the spiritual concerns of the members, even upon the smallest scale on which we can suppose a church to exist; how much more of all the members throughout the world. The head must know the heart of every member, must be acquainted with all its wanderings, its errors, and its sorrows, that he may know how to correct, to re-

* It is not said that every member of a visible Church stands in this gracious relation, because there are many who have intruded themselves into the Church, who have not observed the appointed order of first coming to Christ and believing in him.

store, and to comfort. The Pope, indeed, affects to obtain this knowledge of the hearts of his subjects, by means of confession, but supposing such knowledge to be actually obtained by all his priests, not one in a million of the sins so confessed can ever reach the ears of the Pope; and supposing one sin in a million to reach him, and supposing he enjoins the necessary discipline, he must, in many instances, be unable to apply it; the sinner may live at the distance of thousands of miles; he cannot reach him with the rapidity of thought; he must send some corporeal messenger with a Bull in his pocket: but the poor sinner may be in the other world long before the messenger reach the spot. If it be answered, that every priest has the power of granting absolution, as well as of enjoining penance, then the priest is doing what belongs only to the head to do; the Pope is ignorant of the individual case; and, in so far, he is not the head of the Church. The real head of the Church knows every thought of the heart of every member; and this is necessary to his being head of the Church. He walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks, that is, in the midst of the Churches. His eyes are like a flame of fire, searching the reins and the heart; and he will give to every man according to his works.

Perhaps, some Protestants will not go all the length with me in rejecting human authority in the Church. If so, I cannot help it. It is my decided conviction that there never was, and never will be, any authority lawfully exercised in the Church of God, but the authority of God himself. The Church is the kingdom of heaven,—the kingdom of God,—the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; and why should not he be the sovereign, and lawgiver, and judge, in his own kingdom? He never delegated his sovereign authority to a creature; he never appointed a creature to be the head of his body; the pretensions of the Pope, therefore, are direct treason against the authority of Christ, as really as it would be treason in PAX to give himself out as the King of Great Britain.

I would maintain this principle though there never had been a Pope of an immoral life. I maintain that no creature, not even a holy angel, is capable of being head of the Church, and that God never appointed a creature to fill that station. But many of the Popes were men of the most profligate lives; they were fit successors of the worst of the Cæsars: the Vatican, for all manner of wickedness, will bear a comparison with any heathen temple. Can any man suppose it possible that Christ would delegate his authority to such men? that he would constitute such the head of his Church, which is called to be holy, even as he is holy? The head and the body, in all cases, must partake of the same character. Thus the Church of Christ is a holy

community. It consists of sinful creatures, indeed; but they are sinners, "washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;"—not personally free from sin while in this world; but their perfectly holy Head is carrying them forward to a state of sinless perfection. That Church, then, of which the Pope is the head, must be of the same character with himself. The head and the members must be, in some measure, like one another; and such, in point of fact, it has always been. While the head was practising all manner of wickedness, the Church was represented as "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

"It is known by every body," says a writer of the 17th century, "that the celibacy of that wretched clergy is among them the source of a universal and loathsome impurity; and that the least crimes committed by those of that order are fornications and adulteries."—"It is also known that the Pope authorizes and protects public stews, in order to draw a considerable revenue from them; but it is not so universally known, that to advance the reputation of that crime, (which, indeed, is not accounted any by the Court of Rome,) the Popes will not suffer any women to prostitute themselves, unless they be Christians; and, therefore, by order of his Holiness, Jewish, Pagan, and Mahometan women, who have a mind to set up that trade at Rome, must first be baptized." *Philosophical Library for May*, 1818, p. 81. What must Mahometans and Pagans think of that religion, initiation into which is a necessary qualification for the commission of wickedness?

The Church of Rome had gone such a length in wickedness, that her reformation became impossible; the vital principle had long been extinct. Real Christianity was unknown within her pale, except by some solitary individuals here and there, who were of no consideration in the Church. It was, therefore, as impossible for her to reform herself, as for a dead body to raise itself to life. "When, at the era of the Reformation," says Mr. Cunningham, p. 141, "Pope Adrian the Sixth, a well-meaning pontiff, wished to introduce a reform into the Court of Rome itself, he was dissuaded from it by Cardinal Francis Soderini, Bishop of Preneste, who, among other reasons, used the following:—'That there was no hope of confounding or destroying the Lutherans, by a reformation of the Court of Rome. That, on the contrary, it was the true way to give them more credit; for if the people, who always judge by the event, were to see a reformation begun, they would suppose that since there had been good cause to oppose some abuses, there was room for believing that the other novelties proposed by Luther were well founded.'—'That in reading the history of past ages it may be seen that the heretics

who had rebelled against the authority of the Church of Rome, had always founded their arguments upon the corrupt manners of the Papal court. Still, however, the Popes had never thought it would be of any use to introduce a reform, but had satisfied themselves, after employing exhortations and remonstrances, with engaging princes to protect the Church.—‘ That heresies had never been put an end to by reformation, but by crusades, and by exciting sovereigns and nations to extirpate them. That it was by those means that Innocent the Third happily extinguished that of the Albigenses in Languedoc; and his successors had employed no others against the Waldenses, the Picards,’ &c.—

That it would be impossible to effect any reform without diminishing considerably the ecclesiastical revenues, which were derived from four sources: the one temporal, viz. the domains of the state; the three others spiritual, namely, indulgences, dispensations, and the collation of benefices; and that none of these could be dried up without occasioning to the Holy See a loss of a fourth of its revenues.’ ” The above is extracted from the work of a *Catholic writer* of great authority.—*Histoire du Concile de Trente. Par Fra. Paoli Sarpi, tome I. p. 42, 43.*

Mr. Cunningham then gives an extract from the *Tax* of the Apostolic Chancery, containing the expense of committing certain sins, which see part first, p. 24, of my Letters republished from the Glasgow Chronicle; and then proceeds:—“ Pope Leo X. having, in the year 1517, published a sale of plenary indulgences, made a grant of the revenue to arise therefrom, within the Electorate of Saxony, to his sister Magdalen, married to Cibo, natural son of Pope Innocent VIII. who in consequence of that marriage, had made Leo a Cardinal at fourteen years of age. Magdalen, anxious to make her brothers’ gift as profitable as possible, appointed Aremboldi, then a layman, but subsequently created Archbishop of Milan, to manage the business for her, who intrusted the collection of the indulgences to the highest bidders. These collectors, says Fra. Paoli Sarpi, the Catholic historian already quoted, *caused much scandal by their immoral lives and debaucheries, spending in taverns and elsewhere, in gaming, and other things not fit to be mentioned, what the people saved from their necessary expenses to purchase indulgences.*”

These were the *holy* fathers who could sell the plenary remission of sins to whole nations, that their *bastard* children might be endowed with princely revenues. Very fit and proper heads they were of a Church which was confessedly so corrupt as to be beyond the possibility of reformation; for the argument of Cardinal Soderini must remain in full force while the Church of Rome exists. She cannot reform, for that would be to admit

that she needed reformation, which would justify the complaints of the heretics, and destroy her own infallibility. She must therefore go on from evil to worse, till she be ripe for destruction, which will overtake her at the time appointed.

It is a pretty generally received opinion that the Church of Rome is not so wicked now as she was in former ages. I confess I am of a different opinion. I believe her wickedness is greater now than ever it was, and that it will continue to increase to the end. It is true, she does not now exhibit, in general, such gross immoralities as we read of in her history. We do not hear, for instance, that the present Pope farms out indulgences, as a provision for his own, or his predecessor's natural children. The knowledge that is now diffused over Europe will not permit things to be done, which were openly practised in the days of darkness. But the existence of this knowledge aggravates the wickedness of those who shut their eyes against it; and what are apparently less enormities committed in the present day, may be greater sins than greater enormities were in former days; for sins committed against knowledge are greater than sins of ignorance. Christ tells the Scribes and Pharisees, that if he had not spoken to them they had not had sin: they had been comparatively guiltless; they would not have had the sin of rejecting him, which was the greatest of which they could be guilty.

This applies to the members of the Church of Rome, especially such of them as live in Protestant countries. Some apology may be made for those who lived in the darker ages, and even for those who live at this day in the heart of Spain, where the dense atmosphere of a cruel superstition will not allow one ray of heavenly light to reach the benighted understanding. What can poor sinners do in these circumstances, but trust implicitly to their ghostly fathers, whose interest it is to keep them in darkness? They are sinners, no doubt; and they must perish in their sins, unless divine mercy shall find them out, in spite of their priests, and discover to them the way of salvation. But the wickedness of these is not to be compared with the wickedness of those who live within the sphere of divine illumination, and who shut their eyes against the light.

Rome itself cannot altogether exclude the light that now shines in our hemisphere. But Rome will not come to the light, lest her deeds should be reproved. Rome loves the darkness, and not the light, because her deeds are evil. Light has come, light is shining all around; but Rome will not have it; she prefers the darkness; her language is, "Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." Accordingly, the Pope has prohibited the formation of Bible Societies, and the circulation of the Word

of God. This is greater wickedness in him, than it would have been in the Popes of the dark ages ; because the dispensations of divine Providence, and the enlightened state of the public mind, should have taught him better. Maintaining the old superstitions and idolatries, while the light of divine truth is shining around, while the gospel of the grace of God is urged upon them, the Papists of the present day are more wicked than their fathers ; the Church of Rome is filling up the measure of her iniquities, until the wrath come upon her to the uttermost.

I know that PAX and AMICUS VERITATIS will call this bigotry, and uncharitableness, and what not. A bigot let me be, if I shall be the means of convincing them of their error, of showing them that they are in the way of destruction, of leading them to renounce all dependance upon fellow-creatures, and to trust in Christ alone for the salvation of their souls. Why will they trust in their priest, who is a sinner like themselves ? Why will they trust in the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, when Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, presents himself for their acceptance ; and makes them welcome to come to him directly and immediately as the only refuge from the storm of divine wrath which must fall upon the heads of the ungodly ? What interest can they have, unless they are priests, in propping up the crazy fabric of Romish superstition, which is well known to be an enemy to every social and personal comfort ? It is a system that holds both the souls and bodies of men in bondage ; and wherever it prevails, thick darkness covers the people. They must see that in Glasgow, and over the whole kingdom, the state of society is more comfortable, the intellectual and moral condition of the people more respectable, than in Popish countries. To what is this owing, but to the general diffusion of knowledge ? Popery is hostile to this. He, therefore, who supports the Popish system, is an enemy to the temporal as well as the eternal welfare of his fellow-creatures ; and he brings the displeasure of God upon himself.

THE

Protestant,

No. VII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29th, 1818.

AT first view, one is apt to think that such a fabric as that of Popish infallibility and supremacy must have some solid ground to stand upon. This, however, is by no means the case; and, indeed, for the purposes of error and superstition, the slighter the foundation on which the structure is built, the better. There is then greater scope for the exercise of human ingenuity, and the imagination is in less danger of being obstructed in its career by any troublesome truth.

In some of my late Numbers I have, I think, proved the fact, that the infallibility of the Pope is a doctrine generally held by the Church of Rome; and that the Pope claimed supremacy over persons and kingdoms in all matters, temporal as well as spiritual. In the present Number, I shall consider the arguments by which Papists maintain this infallibility and supremacy.

By the kindness of a friend, I am favoured with the use of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament into English, Fulke's edition, 1601, with the then authorized English version in parallel columns, with marginal notes and annotations. This, I believe, is the first version, in the mother tongue, which the Church of Rome gave to her members in England; and it is given professedly as an antidote to the poison of other translations, which they could not prevent being made into English: not that they by any means thought it necessary, or even proper, in all cases, for the common people to have the word of God in their own language. And they took very good care that this translation of theirs should be rendered as useless to common people as possible; for, besides making it a large and expensive volume, they have perverted, and even smothered the sacred text by their notes and annotations.

They deduce the infallibility of the Pope from Luke xxii. 30, 31. which, in their translation, is as follows: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath required to have you, for to sift as wheat: **BUT I HAVE PRAYED FOR THEE**, that thy faith fail not: and thou once converted confirm thy brethren." One would think it is not easy to find the Pope at all in this passage, not to say his infallibility. Our Saviour, who knew the hearts of all men, saw the secret working of self-confidence in the mind of his disciple. He foresaw the melancholy fall to which this would lead him; and, as an antidote against that despair which might be the natural consequence of such guilt, and which should actually overwhelm another disciple, he told Peter that he had prayed for him, that Satan should not finally prevail against him,—that though his faith might be shaken, or even suspended for an hour in its exercise, the divine principle should not be destroyed. Peter was quite ignorant, at the time, of what Christ referred to, as is evident from the confident reply which he made: of course the words of his Lord could be no encouragement to the commission of the sin of which he was afterwards guilty. But when he found himself guilty of denying his Lord and Master, in the hour of darkness,—when overwhelmed with a sense of his crime; instead of being driven to despair, he would remember the kindness of his Master, who had prayed for him,—he would believe and trust in him anew.

See, now, how the Rhemists find the infallibility of the Pope in this passage:—"Simon, Simon.] Lastly, to put them out of doubt, he calleth Peter twice by name, and telling him the devil's desire to sift and try them all to the uttermost (as he did that night), saith that he hath especially prayed for him, to this end that his faith should never fail, and that he, being once converted, should after that for ever confirm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith. Which is to say, that Peter is that man whom he would make superior over them and the whole Church. Whereby we may learn, that it was thought fit, in the providence of God, that he who should be the head of the Church should have a special privilege, by Christ's prayer and promise, never to fail in faith, and that none other Apostle, Bishop, or Priest, may challenge any such singular or special prerogative, either of his office or person, otherwise than joining in faith with Peter, and by holding of him. 'The danger (saith St. Leo) was common to all the Apostles, but our Lord took special care of Peter, that the state of all the rest might be more sure, if the head were invincible: God so dispensing the aid of his grace that the assurance and strength which Christ gave to Peter, might redound by Peter to the rest of the Apostles.' St. Augustine also: 'Christ praying for Peter, prayed for the rest, because, in the pastor and prelate,

the people is corrected or commended.' And St. Ambrose writeth, that Peter, after his tentation, was made Pastor of the Church, because it was said to him, *Thou being converted, confirm thy brethren.* Neither was this privilege of St. Peter's person, but of his office, that he should not fail in faith, but ever confirm all others in their faith. For the Church, for whose sake that privilege was thought necessary in Peter, the head thereof, was to be preserved no less afterward than in the Apostle's time. Whereupon all the fathers apply this privilege of not failing, and of confirming others in faith, to the Roman Church, and Peter's successors in the same. 'To which (saith St. Cyprian) infidelity or false faith cannot come.' And St. Bernard saith, writing to Innocentius, Pope, against Abailardus the heretic, 'We must refer to your Apostleship all the scandals and perils which may fall, in matters of faith specially. For there the defects of faith must be holpen, where faith cannot fail. For to what other See was it ever said, *I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith do not fail?*' So say the Fathers, not meaning that none of Peter's seat can err in person, understanding, private doctrine, or writings; but that they cannot, nor shall not, ever judicially conclude or give definitive sentence for falsehood or heresy against the Catholic faith, in their consistories, courts, councils, decrees, deliberations, or consultations, kept for decision and determination of such controversies, doubts, or questions of faith, as shall be proposed unto them: because Christ's prayer and promise protect them therein for confirmation of their brethren. And no marvel that our Master would have his Vicar's consistory and seat infallible, seeing even in the old law the high priesthood and chair of Moses wanted not great privilege in this case, though nothing like the Church's and Peter's prerogative. But, in both, any man of sense may see the difference between the person and the office, as well in doctrine as life. Liberius in persecution might yield; Marcellinus for fear might commit idolatry; Honorius might fall to heresy; and, more than all this, some Judas might creep into the office: and yet all this without prejudice to the office and seat, in which (saith St. Augustine) *our Lord hath set the doctrine of truth.* Caiaphas, by privilege of his office, prophesied right of Christ, but, according to his own knowledge and faith, knew not Christ. The evangelists and other penmen of holy writ, for the execution of that function had the assistance of God, and so far could not possibly err; but that Luke, Mark, Solomon, or the rest, might not err in their other and private writings, that we say not. It was not the personal wisdom, virtue, learning, or faith of Christ's Vicars that made St. Bernard seek to Innocentius the Third; St. Augustine, and the Bishops of Africa, to Innocentius the First, and

to Celestinus, ch. 90, 92, 95.; St. Chrysostom to the said Innocentius; St. Basil to the Pope in his time, ch. 52.; St. Hierom to Damasus, ch. 57, 80.; but it was the prerogative of their office and higher degree of unction, and Christ's ordinance, that would have all Apostles and Pastors in the world, for their confirmation in faith and ecclesiastical regimen, depend on Peter. The lack of knowledge, and humble acceptation of which God's providence, that is, that one is not honoured and obeyed of all the brotherhood, is the cause of all schisms, and heresies, saith St. Cyprian. A point of such importance, that all the twelve being in apostleship, like Christ, would yet, for the better keeping of unity and truth, have one to be head of them all, that a head being once appointed, occasion of schism may be taken away, saith St. Hierom, *lib. I. adv. Jovinian, c. 14.*"

Fulke has a long note upon this annotation, in which he goes over and refutes the errors and absurdities contained in it; but it appears to me that any reader of common sense may refute it for himself, if he will be at the pains to read the passage in the gospel of Luke, in connexion with the history of Christ's sufferings, and the defection of Peter. They must be doctors of more than ordinary acuteness who can find in the words addressed to that Apostle, in reference to his fall, a proof that he was infallible; and it must require still more acuteness to find, in these words a proof of the infallibility of the Pope, who, they say, sits in the chair of Peter.

That Peter was infallible in all that he preached and wrote, as an Apostle of Christ, is not denied, but firmly maintained. He was not, however, more so than the other Apostles; and Paul who was afterwards added to their number, speaks of himself as not a whit behind Peter, or any of them. He certainly did not hold his faith of Peter. The gospel which he preached, he received not from man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ; and, as if to set aside any claim of superiority over the other Apostles, which might be made on behalf of Peter, he was suffered to fall into some great mistakes, in his personal private intercourse with the believers in Antioch. He was himself by this time instructed with regard to Christian liberty. He knew that there was no sin in eating, or holding familiar intercourse, with believing Gentiles, and he had freely maintained such intercourse, Gal. ii. 11—14.; but when some Jews came from James (I suppose from Jerusalem), he was afraid that they would find fault with him for his condescension to the Gentile converts; and, instead of labouring to remove their Jewish prejudices, and not thinking how much the Gentiles would be afflicted by the circumstance, he withdrew, and separated himself from them, fearing them of the circumcision.

Barnabas, and other believing Jews, were seduced by his example, and great mischief was likely to have followed, when Paul maintained the cause of truth, and righteousness, and Christian liberty, at the expense of what must have been painful to himself, withstanding Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed.

The Rhemish translators render the 11th verse,—“ And when Cephas was come to Antioch, I resisted him in face, because he was reprehensible.” They have a long annotation upon the humility of Peter, in condescending to be reprehended by an inferior, such as Paul, as they say a good priest, or any virtuous person, may even tell the Pope his faults; and then, upon the word *reprehensible* they have the following:—“ The heretics hereof again infer, that Peter then did err in faith, and therefore the Popes may fail therein also. To which we answer, that howsoever other Popes may err in their private teachings or writings, whereof we have treated before in the annotation upon these words, *That thy faith fail not*, it is certain, that St. Peter did not here fail in faith, or err in doctrine or knowledge, for it was *conversationis non predicationis vitium*, as Tertullian saith, *de prescript. nu. 7*. It was a default in conversation, life, or regiment, which may be committed by any man, be he never so holy, and not in doctrine. St. Augustine, and whosoever make most of it, think no otherwise of it. But St. Hierom, and many other holy fathers, deem it to have been no fault at all, nor any other thing than St. Paul himself did upon the like occasion: and that this whole combat was a set thing agreed upon between them. It is a school point much debated betwixt St. Hierom and St. Augustine, *ch. 9, 11, 19. apud August.*”

So, it seems, according to these fathers, Peter and Paul, like two mountebanks, agreed upon a sham dispute or combat, to amuse the people of Antioch, or to pick their pockets! Very much, indeed, like the tricks of Romish priests, but most remote from the whole conduct and character of the Apostles.

Many a plain text is strained and tortured to make it appear that Peter was appointed head of the college of Apostles, and universal Bishop. They make him out to have been Bishop of Rome, without any authority from the New Testament whatever, except that he dates his first epistle from Babylon.—“ The church that is at Babylon saluteth you.” “ The ancient fathers,” say the Rhemists, “ namely, St. Hierom, and many more, agree that Rome is meant here by the word Babylon, as also in the xvth and xviith of the Apocalypse.” So, it seems, rather than lose the honour and advantage of Peter’s having been at Rome, they are content to assume the name which certainly was given to her by the Spirit of prophecy, as expressive of her unparalleled wicked-

ness,—“Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.” And what though Peter had visited Rome, and though he had written his first epistle there? It does not follow from this that he was Bishop of Rome. But suppose for a moment that he was so; what then? Why, then, all the Bishops of Rome, ever since, must have had the same authority and infallibility that Peter had; and as Peter was head over all the other Apostles and of the whole church, so the Bishop or Pope of Rome is head of the church, and supreme over all her clergy!

The first thing to be established is, that our Lord appointed Peter to be head or prince of the Apostles. This is proved by the Rhemists from John xvi. 17. “Feed my sheep.” They give as many quotations from saints and fathers to prove Peter’s supremacy from this passage, as would fill half my sheet. The substance of the argument is in the words of the translators: “And that Christ maketh a difference betwixt Peter and the rest, and giveth him some greater pre-eminence and regimen than the rest, it is plain, by that he asked whether he loved our Lord more than the other Apostles do: where, for equal charge, no difference of love had been required.” Thus Peter is proved to be the prince of the Apostles!

Next, his supremacy over the whole church is to be proved. This is done from Luke v. 2, 3. which in their translation is,—“And he saw two ships standing by the lake; and the fishers were gone down and washed their nets. And he, going up into one ship that was Simon’s, desired him to bring it back a little from the land. And sitting, he taught the multitudes out of the ship.” Annotation: “*One ship; Simon’s.*” It is purposely expressed that there were two ships, and that one of them was Peter’s, and that Christ went into that one, and sat down in it, and that sitting, he taught out of that ship, no doubt to signify the Church resembled by Peter’s ship, and that in it is the chair of Christ, and only true preaching.” Thus the Church of Rome is proved to be nothing less than the ship of Peter; and who can deny that he ought to be sole commander in his own ship?

There remains to be proved that Peter was Bishop of Rome. This is not so easily done from the New Testament. That Peter ever was in Rome, is by no means certain; though the people in that city, within these few years, affected to give ocular demonstration of the fact: “A principal design of Peter’s coming to Rome was to oppose Simon Magus, who, by his juggling tricks, had procured the favour of both the emperor and the people. At their first interview, the magician engaged to ascend into the air, in the presence of him and the whole city. With the help of the devil, he accordingly performed his promise; but Peter invoking the name of Jesus, the devil was so terrified, that he left Simon Ma-

gus to shift for himself; and the consequence was, that his body having a much greater predilection for the earth than heaven, made such haste downward as to break both his legs. Were any person to question the truth of this narration at Rome, the impression of the Apostle's knees in the very stone upon which he knelt on this occasion, would be shown him, and another stone still tinged with the blood of the magician." *McCulloch*, p. 14. Allowing this to be sufficient proof of Peter's having been at Rome, where is the proof of his having been Bishop of that See? There is in fact not a shadow of evidence for any such thing in the whole New Testament. Peter was the Apostle of the circumcision. He received a commission, like the other Apostles, to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; but he laboured principally for the conversion of sinners of his own nation, while Paul laboured chiefly among the Gentiles. Paul certainly was at Rome; but it was not consistent with the commission which he, or any of the Apostles, had received, that they should be permanently fixed as Bishops over one church. They appointed Bishops, or Elders, to be ordained in every church: they took the oversight of these, because they were divinely inspired to set in order all things in the churches, and to prescribe the duty of the office-bearers, as well as of the private members. The Apostles were Christ's ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary; and they were fully qualified for this office by the Holy Spirit, who was in them, not only as he is in all believers, for their instruction, sanctification, and comfort, but also by the extraordinary gift of inspiration.

Peter was not, and from the nature of his office as an Apostle, could not be, Bishop of Rome: yet the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumption of this as a fact. The Pope claims all his power and authority as the successor of Peter in the See of Rome. It would be easy to show that Peter had no successor at Rome, or any where else; for the gifts of inspiration were not meant to descend from father to son, or from one Bishop to another. The office of apostleship terminated with the lives of the Apostles; and none can lawfully pretend to be their successors, unless they can show themselves possessed of the same power of working miracles, and of the other extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. But, independently of this, as Peter never was Bishop of Rome, the Pope's pretence of being his successor is a piece of gross imposition upon the credulity of his deluded adherents. His whole system rests upon a falsehood: and as is the foundation, so is the superstructure; it is lies and imposition throughout.

I would not be doing the Church of Rome justice, if I were to overlook one principal argument which they derive from the New Testament, to wit, from *Matth. xvi. 18, 19.* which the Rhemists

render nearly as in our own version. "And I say unto thee, thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in the heavens. And whatsoever thou shalt loose in earth, shalt be loosed also in the heavens." On this passage they have copious annotations, intended to prove that Peter is the rock upon which the church is built; they maintain, on the authority of St. Hierom, that this rock is not Peter's person only, but his successors and his chair. "I join myself," says he, "to the communion of Peter's chair, *upon that rock I know the Church was built*. And that same apostolic chair, saith St. Augustine, that same is the rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome." On similar authority they find that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter *and his successors*;—"that is," say they, "the authority or chair of doctrine, knowledge, judgment, and discretion, between true and false doctrine: the heights of government, the power of making laws, of calling councils, of the principal voice in them, of confirming them, of making canons and wholesome decrees, of abrogating the contrary, of ordaining Bishops and Pastors, of deposing and suspending them; finally, the power to dispense the goods of the Church both spiritual and temporal." In short, the power granted by the gift of the keys to the Pope, as Peter's successor, is called, "in comparison of the power granted to other Apostles, Bishops, and Pastors, *plenitudo potestatis*, fulness of power. Under the words binding and loosing, they seem to give to the Pope and his pastors all possible power in earth and heaven, with regard to the temporal and eternal state of men.

I allow that, in the words quoted from the xvth of Matthew, our Lord did confer singular honour upon Peter; but what is all this to the Church of Rome, or to the Pope? The Church of Rome, in its best days, had no more connexion with Peter, than the Church of Antioch,—perhaps not so much. Suppose it were not the truth which Peter confessed, (thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God) but the person of Peter on which the Church is built, (a very absurd supposition) what is this to the Pope of Rome? What though Christ did give the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, and honour him to be the instrument of opening the door of the New Testament Church, by being the first to preach the good news of the glory of Christ to both Jews and Gentiles? What, I say, is this to the Pope? He has never proved his natural or ecclesiastical descent from Peter; it is impossible that he even can prove it; and all the elaborate arguments of saints and fathers, to prove the supremacy of the Pope from this passage, go for nothing.

THE
Protestant,

No. VIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER, 5th, 1818.

IN my last number, I said it was very uncertain whether the apostle Peter had ever been at Rome. I do not say it is certain he never was there; for I admit there is a very early tradition of his having been in that city. It is, however, merely tradition; and no man is under any obligation to believe it. If it had even the authority of authentic history,—if it were a fact as well established as the murder of Julius Cæsar by Brutus, which it is not,—it would still be a matter of mere history, and not the subject of faith, in a religious sense. I should believe it just as I believe the fact of Cæsar's murder; but rest no religious principle or practice upon it.

The Bible is sufficient for every purpose of Christian faith and practice; and what I find not written in the sacred Volume, however true it may be as a matter of history, or however plausible as a speculative opinion, I hold it of no account whatever in determining any point in religion. The Rhemish translators are extremely angry with the Protestants for disbelieving Peter's having been at Rome, while I suppose most of them neither believe nor disbelieve it. It is a matter that cannot be ascertained; and if it could, it would be of little consequence. I shall give the Rhemists' account of the matter, with this remark, that they are generally most positive when they have the slightest ground to go upon: "Never sect-masters made more foul or hard shifts to prove or defend falsehood, than the Protestants: but on two points, about St. Peter specially, they pass even themselves in impudencie. The first is, that they hold he was not preferred before the other Apostles, which is against all Scripture most evidently. The second is, that he was never at Rome, which is against all the ecclesiastical histories, all the fathers, Greek and

Latin, against the very sense and sight of the monuments of his seat, sepulchre, doctrine, life, and death, there. Greater evidence, certes, there is thereof, and more weighty testimony than of Romulus', Numas', Cæsar's, or Cicero's being there: yet were he a very brutish man that would deny this to the discredit of so many writers and the whole world. Much more monstrous it is to hear any deny the other." They then give the opinions and assertions of many fathers on the subject, all of whom, however, derived their knowledge of the fact from a vague tradition; and they are by no means agreed about the time of his coming there, or how long he stayed, or when, and what death, he died. As for the proof of his being there, derived from his sepulchre, this is about as good as the story of his contest with Simon Magus, as related in my last Number; for the half of his body is at St. Peter's, in Rome, the other half at St. Paul's; he has, besides, another head at St. John's, Lateran; his under jaw, with the beard upon it, is at Poitiers, in France; many of his bones are at Trieirs; and part of his brain at Geneva, or rather was so before the days of Calvin; for he, or some other heretic, found out that this was only a pumice stone. This precious relick is now at Rome, having been brought thither by order of the Pope, after Geneva had, by her apostasy and heresy, become unworthy to retain it. It stands in the catalogue of relicks thus:—"The brains of St. Peter, from Geneva.—*Note.* These are the individual brains which that arch-heretic Calvin declared were a mere pumice stone, sinning against God, the holy Apostle, and his own soul." *Philos. Lib. for June, 1818.*

The above may be considered supplementary to my last Number, in which I had not room for it. It is my earnest desire to do my opponents no injustice, which they would accuse me of doing, if I were to omit their strongest arguments in support of the fact of Peter's having been at Rome. As for his being at any time bishop of Rome, that is what I most confidently deny, and I defy the whole Church of Rome to prove it from any authentic history. Nay, I defy them to show who were the first, second, and third bishops of that See. Suppose it were admitted that Peter was the first, no one can tell who succeeded him. There is a blank in the Pope's genealogy which all the world cannot fill up.

The following short sketch of the rise and progress of the papal supremacy may be interesting to the reader. It is taken from the Philosophical Library of June last:—"The apostles and bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome, for preaching Christ crucified, were so occupied for the space of the first three hundred years, that they had no leisure to dream of supremacy: after which time, (as rest breeds rust) by little and little they grew ambitious, and now and then one bishop or other would affect

priority: so that, about the end of the next three hundred years, they began to desire primacy but not supremacy; as POLYCARPE, bishop of Jerusalem, challenged the first place, 426 years after Christ. GELACIUS, bishop of Rome, after him, about 445. JUSTIN, emperor of Rome, made MISDA bishop of Rome, patriarch, about 520. About the same time, JOHN, bishop of Constantinople, was called universal bishop.”—“ PELAGIUS, bishop of Rome, was the first that challenged the primacy by Scripture. JOHN, bishop of Constantinople, called himself universal bishop, 582. GREGORY the great, bishop of Rome, first of that name reprov’d JOHN of Constantinople, for calling himself universal bishop, 591.” His words are,—“ I do confidently affirm, that whosoever doth call himself universal bishop, or desire to be so called, is the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride.”—“ Before him, JOHN the third, bishop of Rome, declared that none should be called *summus sacerdos*, or universal bishop, about 562.

“ All this while not one thought of a Pope, or of Peter’s successor in Rome.

“ Now PHOCAS, servant to Mauritius, the emperor, killed his master, the empress, and children most cruelly: at this time BONIFACE the third, bishop of Rome, obtained of this butcher the title to be called universal bishop, anno 607. Therefore, the primacy of the bishop of Rome was first established by a murderer and a traitor, who died afterwards most miserably; for, in 612 of Christ, he was slain by the soldiers of his guard.”

Thus we see that six centuries of the Christian era elapsed before the bishop of Rome rose so high as to be called universal bishop. Where was the chair and the supremacy of Peter all this while? and who was the man that so much as imagined that the bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter, and, as such, the head of the Catholic Church? It was not till after the light of knowledge had been almost extinguished in Europe,—when artful priests could teach the people any thing they pleased without fear of being contradicted,—when they began to collect and teach, as infallible truths, the traditions, and opinions, and even the conjectures, of their predecessors, whom they honoured with the titles of saints and fathers: It was not, in short, till they found the people in a state of the most sottish ignorance, and prepared to believe any thing, that they began to put forward the claim of the bishop of Rome to be the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church.

The Papists lay great stress on the evidence of antiquity; but the evidence of real antiquity proves the Pope to be no more the successor of Peter, than of Judas Iscariot; and if the proof arising from similarity of character be of any weight, the Popes will be

found to have been worthy successors of the last named Apostle. But, as I have said already, the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumed fact of the Pope being the successor of Peter in the See of Rome. As this, then, is not a fact,—as Peter never was bishop of Rome, and as he never had a successor in office,—the monstrous fabric of Popish superstition and domination is left without so much as a stone to stand upon.

I have said much more on this subject than was necessary in merely replying to the letter of PAX; but, as I had my hand in the work, I thought a few hours could not be employed to better purpose than in giving a short sketch of the arrogant claims of the Romish Church, and of the arguments by which they are supported. This is a subject deeply interesting at the present time; and, I am sorry to say, it has been much neglected, even by the reading part of the community. Papists have been long working their way under ground, in order to regain the footing which they once possessed in this country. From the extreme liberality of the age, it has been reckoned a cruel thing to say a word against them; we were all willing to view Popery as now quite harmless, whatever it might have been in former ages. Papists have therefore become more bold. From the indulgence and countenance which they have received from Protestants, they can now speak, and write, and publish, the grossest calumnies against the persons and religion of Protestants, expecting that they, poor simpletons! either cannot or will not be at the pains to answer them. I have partly shown already, and I hope yet farther to show, that the Popish system is as bad as ever it was,—that it retains all its malignity and opposition to the gospel of Christ, and to the best interests of men; and that, therefore, while I maintain that it would be unlawful to injure Papists in their persons or property, I hold it to be the duty of every Christian to maintain an unceasing opposition to their whole system of false religion,—the opposition of calm and sober argument, drawn from the word of God, which ultimately will prevail.

It does not at present occur to me that I have any more to say in reply to PAX. I think I have answered every thing in his letters that required an answer, that is, almost every sentence of them. I have, however, a great deal of work before me in performing the like duty towards AMICUS VERITATIS, whose letters, in the Glasgow Chronicle, are almost as full of errors and misrepresentations as of sentences. I expect these letters, along with my own, will be republished in a few days, after which the reader will have it in his power to form a better judgment of my reply. In the mean time, I shall indulge myself and the reader with a little miscellaneous matter.

[The miscellaneous matter mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and which extended from this page to page 77, having been the subject of a jury trial, and found injurious to private character, the proprietors have judged proper to omit in the present edition. Their only object in republishing, as they know it was Mr M'Gavin's, in originally writing the work, being the sincere wish to serve the Protestant cause, by diffusing the knowledge of the truth, and by a faithful exposition of Roman Catholic errors; and as the errors of that church are not only flagrant, but substantiated by her avowed standards, there is no need of departing from them to deal in personalities or fasten odium on individuals. The passages, therefore, above referred to, are suppressed, and the blank filled up with matter of a general nature.]

The following extracts, from unquestionable documents (quoted from Dr Brownlee's "Letters on the Roman Catholic Controversy: New York, 1834,") show the infamous resources of money-raising to which Popery addresses herself, wholly for secular, sensual, or pious uses, so called; together with the immoralities to which that church lends the sanction of her authority, and that, too, very obviously for the purpose of driving a better trade, in the matters of expurgation, confession, and absolution:—

"*TAXÆ CANCELLARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ; ET TAXÆ SACRÆ PENITENTIARIÆ,*
THE POPE'S BANK, OR CHANCERY TAX BOOK.

"I have before me these *taxæ* in two different editions; first *taxæ* from the archives of the 'Roman Chancery,' in the British museum, Nos. 1650, 1651, 1652. The money is marked in *Grossi*; it is in the original Latin.—Second, an edition in the original Latin, with a French translation; having the text as copied and corrected by Antoine du Pinet, Lord of Noroy, in Franche-comte. Rivet drew the exact copy of his edition from the Paris edition of the Chancery Book of A. D. 1520. Voetius also exhibits the ancient editions; and Bayle, in his Dict., article *Banck*. Claud D'Espence, a popish doctor, mentions 'Les Taxes de la Chancellerie Apostolique,' as a book well known in his day, and holds it up to odium; see his Digr. ii. ad Epist. ad Titum. cap. 1. There were three editions of the *Taxæ* at Paris; one is dated 1523; two at Cologne, one dated in 1532; two at Venice; one at Wirtemberg, dated 1538. The copy from which I take my extracts is printed from that of Pinet of 1564. It bears date of 1744. Several editions were published by Protestant doctors in the 17th century; they were carefully printed from the early Roman Catholic editions. No literary man now denies the authority of this

genuine Romish work. I refer to the edition now before me, and the statements of Dr Drelincourt, and Mons. Bayle, in defence of its authenticity. The following is offered as a specimen, in addition to what is given page 24; the pages marked are of the edition of Pinet, which I use.

“ ‘Absolutio, &c. Absolution, in form, for a dying person, the tax is fourteen carlins.’ See p. 73. ‘Absolution for a confraternity, or a *societas*, fifty carl.,’ p. 74. ‘Absolution of a priest for celebrating a clandestine marriage, seven carl.,’ p. 88. ‘Absolution of a priest for keeping a concubine, and a dispensation for his *irregularities*, &c., seven carlins,’ p. 89. ‘Absolution of a layman for keeping a concubine, eight carlins,’ p. 89. (It is one carlin more wicked in him than in a ‘holy priest!’)

“ ‘Absolutio pro eo qui matrem, sororem, aut aliam consanguinem, aut commatrem, carnaliter cognovit, taxatur ad 5 carlinos,’ p. 89. ‘Absolutio pro eo qui virginem defloravit, 6 carlins,’ p. 89. ‘For forging apostolical dispensations, seventeen carlins,’ p. 94. ‘For simony, six carlins,’ p. 90. ‘A layman killing any ecclesiastic less than a bishop, provided he present himself at the apostolical seat, is taxed at seven, or eight, or nine carlins,’ p. 94. ‘For a layman killing a layman, five carlins,’ p. 96.

“ ‘From Titulo XX. I copy the following. ‘Absolution for him who has killed his father, his mother, his brother, sister, wife, or other relative, tax is five carlins, provided he be a layman; if any of them be of clerical rank, he must, besides that fine, visit the apostolical seat,’ p. 97, 98. In Titulo XXI., entitled ‘Additions of Absolutions,’ this crime is taxed at ‘one ducat, five carlins,’ p. 102. ‘For striking one’s wife, and causing a miscarriage, eight carlins,’ p. 98. ‘For a woman to use poisons to cause abortion, tax five carlins,’ p. 99. In Titulo XXI., p. 103, the female doing this ‘is taxed one ducat, six carlins.’ ‘For pushing oneself into holy orders without the bishop’s license, tax two ducats,’ p. 102. ‘For a priest who strikes another priest after mass, three ducats,’ p. 103. ‘But if he beat him before he celebrated the mass, the tax is two ducats,’ p. 103. (In the first case, the wafer-god is in him; in the last, it is not!)

“ ‘Absolution and permission to bury a suicide in holy ground, one ducat, nine carlins,’ p. 104. ‘For a priest entering holy orders by simony, four ducats, four carlins,’ p. 105. ‘For an abbot or bishop killing a man, his tax is fifty tournois, twelve ducats, six carlins,’ p. 123. ‘For killing a bishop, or abbot, or any superior prelate, the tax is thirty-six tournois, nine ducats,’ p. 136. These are among ‘the *additional taxes*.’

“ ‘In Titulo XXXII. and XXXIII. I find the following:— ‘Absolution for a man killing a wife, the same as killing a father

or mother, four tournois, one ducat, eight carlins,' p. 139. 'Dispensation to the man who has killed his wife, to marry another wife, the tax is eight tournois, nine carlins,' p. 139. 'For killing an infant, four tournois, one ducat, nine carlins,' p. 139.

" 'Absolution for theft, sacrilege, burning houses, rapine, perjury, thirty-six tour., nine ducats,' p. 145. 'Absolution of a priest for the most licentious deeds, thirty-six tour., three ducats,' p. 154. 'Absolution and dispensation for a priest keeping a concubine, twenty-one tour., five ducats, six carlins.' 'Absolution of a nun for fornication, thirty-six tourn., five ducats,' p. 155. 'Absolution of an adulterer, four tourn.' 'Absolution of a layman for any act of uncleanness, six tourn., two ducats,' p. 156.

" This is a specimen of the Pope's Chancery Book, which was ordered, by papal authority, to be denied, and held up by all priests, 'as a wicked forgery of the Protestants.' But editions still exist in Europe that were printed in 1520. Of course it could not have been invented by them. Besides, as we have hinted already, Romish doctors of more pure morals have declaimed against it, as a regular, authorized book. And it is an historical fact, that this denial was not given out until it was discovered by the Papists that the book had fallen into the Protestants' hands! But why deny the book of tariff, when every one who goes to confession *does pay*; and every friend of souls in purgatory *must pay*, for masses to bring them out!

" I beg leave to add one curious quotation. At the end of the chapter of 'Absolutions to marry within a certain degree,' and 'in case of divorces,' it is added,— '*Note well: graces and dispensations of this kind are not conceded to the poor: because they have no means, therefore they cannot be comforted!*' See folio XXIII., edit. 1520; and p. 208, edit. of 1625; also folio CXXX., edit. of 1545; and p. 19 of the edition which I use.

" It appears that in each country the priests adapted the tax to the current money of the realm, and to the poorer or richer circumstances of the knaves who applied for relief, and a good bargain in this popish 'traffic of human souls.'—See Revel. xviii. 13.

" GROSS IMPURITY ENJOINED BY POPES AND COUNCILS.

" In the Decretals of Gratian, Dist. 39, we have the following canon from the council of Toledo:— '*Qui non habet uxorem, loco illius concubinam habere debet.* He who has not a wife *ought*, in the place of one, to have a concubine.'

" In the seventeenth canon of that council it was enacted,— '*Christiano habere licitum est unam tantum aut uxorem, aut*

certe loco uxoris concubinam. It is lawful for a Christian to have only one wife, or certainly, in the place of a wife, a concubine.' Pithou Corpus Jur. canon, p. 47, Paris edit., 1687. Binius, Concil. Tom. i. p. 737, 739, 740, states the same; and adds, that the canons of this council were confirmed by Pope Leo. Edgar's Var. of Popery, p. 503. This permission, says Gianon, extends to the clergy and laity; Hist. of Naples, xi. 7.

"Behold the imposing claims of *sanctity* admirably demonstrated! And we are not copying the doctrines and practices of the *dark ages*. **POPERY NEVER CHANGES TO THE BETTER!** This is the immutable law of its nature! And no well informed man, nor any who has travelled in popish countries, needs to be told this. Men who read not on this subject, and who think less, and those who have none of the genuine Roman Catholic books, but who draw some superficial views from some of their amiable and liberal Catholic neighbours and friends, are seen to labour under fatal mistakes in this matter. They believe the Romish sect *to be improved and reformed!* My humble prayer to God is, that he would open their eyes, and convince them of their error. I declare with deep solemnity, and I appeal to ancient and modern history for evidence,—that *the popery of Rome never has altered, never can alter for the better, without being destroyed and annihilated.* The Romish church claims immutability and infallibility. She appeals to God, and says she never has erred, never committed deadly sins, never has changed, never has reformed, nor has ever needed reformation!

"Every man who has been in Italy, in Spain, in Portugal, in Switzerland, in South America, and Mexico, has seen this inscription on the fronts of the various churches, even to this day, 'Plenary indulgences sold here,' at such and such prices. Again—'The bishop of ——— sells indulgences here,' at—such and such *low* prices. 'An English gentleman,' said my friend Dr Avery, 'was with me at Naples, and on reading the sign over the *Indulgence shop*, he went in and gravely purchased, for a small sum, an indulgence to do any sin for *one hundred days!*

"I would beg those men who think so favourably of modern Popery to read Dr Moore's 'Tour in Europe,' and Graham's 'Rome in the Nineteenth Century.' I refer to 'Rome as it Is, a Tour in Italy, by Miss Morton:' she finds and pronounces Italy a large nation of atheists! Also Lady Morgan's 'Rome in the Nineteenth Century.'

THE
Protestant,

No. IX.

A PARABLE.

THE following vigorously-written parable is extracted from the Rev. Dr Brownlee's "Letters on the Roman Catholic Controversy," published at New York in 1833-4.

Once upon a time, the good St Peter was sitting, in the cool of the morning, under a rich clustering vine in the lovely green vale of Jehosaphat, and in earnest discourse with a friend. The holy apostle, and he, had retired from the dust and heat of Jerusalem ; and they were discussing an important question, in a grave and solemn manner befitting such men. The apostle's friend was a chief priest ; a noted man, and a bosom friend to Nicodemus. His faith had been shaken in the Jewish system ; and he was devoutly inquiring how he should arrive fully at the truth and be saved. He had discovered with no small degree of alarm, that the truth was no longer in the Jewish system and church. The pure word of God the Jewish doctors had impiously displaced, and rendered void by the fatal traditions of their fathers. The pure system of Moses was no longer honoured and received by them ; and with a singular inconsistency, what was abolished in the ceremonial law, they now clung to with great obstinacy. The high priest and his associates in despotism, had usurped power over the souls and consciences of men ; they set no bounds to their avarice, pride, and luxury. They traded "in the souls of men ;" they even professed to open heaven and shut the gates of hell, at the ecclesiastical chancery prices ! They sold pardons and permissions to sin at all rates ; from Judas's sum of thirty shekels up to the talent of silver, and the lordly talent of gold !

"The temple is converted into a house of merchandise,—my dear Peter." said the chief priest, as he fanned his burning

brow with his snow-white turban,—“ In the midst of this universal corruption, the kingdom of God I cannot find. Now inasmuch as he declared to our father Abraham, that his church should never fail, and repeated it to David, and all the prophets, and it would be mockery to look for it amid the universal corruptions of our high priest, and our chief priests, and rulers of the synagogue ; it must be found somewhere else, it must be found in *the new upstart, Christian church* just organized ; or is it not to be found even there ?”

St Peter opened up to him the Scriptures, and went on comparing the Old Testament doctrine with those of Christ, in order to show him that this *new reformed upstart church, the Christian church alone* held the whole and only genuine truths of God. And he was patiently bringing home to his heart, with many prayers, these apostolical instructions ; and instructing him in the right way of the Lord God of his fathers ; while he kept a strict eye on a singular, suspicious, and ill-looking stranger, who had entered the harbour, and had placed himself not far from them. He was bedecked in a fantastic dress, of many colours, neither exactly Jewish, nor altogether Gentile in its shape ; and there was a wildness in his looks and antic gestures, which indicated the phrenzy of a madman, or to say the least, the air of a designing knave !

St Peter went on discoursing of the trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, faith and repentance ; and the justification of a sinner by faith in Christ without the deeds of the law ; and thence the absolute necessity of good works and a holy life. He was very particular in showing him that God only is the supreme Lord of the conscience ; that no human or ghostly power on earth, should be permitted by any who calls himself a man, and not a dumb brute, to usurp power over the conscience, or dictate a form of religion to it. “ Think, read, judge, decide for yourself. None of the Jewish priests, nor any priest under these heavens, can dare to prescribe to your conscience ; go to God’s law, and word, and his inspired apostles. God speaks : listen, obey ; and count that man an emissary of the devil, fresh from the burning lake, who would dare to lord it over your conscience ; to offer to appease God for you ; or to pardon your sins for a few Jerusalem coppers ! He is the arch-impostor—the antichrist ; of which our beloved brother John will tell you more fully.

Here the singular stranger grew so impatient, that he could no longer contain himself ; and he rudely cut short the apostle’s discourse, by abruptly crying out—“ Do you call me the impostor or the antichrist ?” Then addressing himself to the chief priest, for he was evidently a stranger to St Peter,—he besought him not to give heed to one word uttered by that

"*hoary-headed deceiver*;" for the holy order of the high priest, and the chief priests have the entire keeping of men's consciences. And they negotiate with Heaven the whole of man's salvation for a *moderate consideration*.—But I am forgetting myself. To give divine efficacy to my words, and confound all heretics, I must have in my soul *the intention*; and on my body the consecrated apostolical raiment, such as St Peter the prince and pope; were he present,—would laud and bless;" and upon that he applied himself to the work.

He rose up and made certain genuflections, and prostrations to the east and west; he then decked himself out in party-coloured patches and rags, of red, purple, and white, and green; and putting on a thing resembling three crowns on his head; he went to an adjoining thicket, and cut a tall rod, the top of which he twisted into a shepherd's crook. And coming gravely up; he stood with a solemn, demure, half-crying countenance, for a few moments; then whispered—"Now I have got the *unction of holy intention*; now for the grace-procuring gestures and genuflections." And with that he applied himself gravely to a succession of bodily exercises, *forty-five* in number; sometimes he bowed; then he kneeled; then he elevated his arms aloft. And having counted his *forty-fifth*, he sat down quite out of breath. "Now," said he, "what I am going to say, no one dare gainsay, under peril of salutary *cold steel* and the *hot fire*,—to wit, heading and burning! This crown, the emblem of power, and this sceptre, the symbol of pastoral qualification and care, God Almighty made with his own hands; and with his own hands he placed on my head, and in these hands!"

The apostle would have interrupted him;—but he silenced him with an outrageous clamour; and he went on engrossing the whole conversation to himself. "I am God's vice-god upon earth; I am supreme; by me kings and priests reign and act; I am the lord of the human conscience: God has put this ghostly power in my unworthy hands, who am a servant of servants."—And while the words of humility were on his lips, he tossed his sceptre; and waved his lordly triple crown on high;—then he went on;—"The revelation which God has given to the Hebrews and the Christians, derives all its authority and all its evidence from ME; it is the word of God if I say it; it is not if I say *no*: I add to it and I take away, and who shall set bounds to this spiritual sceptre! I have the keys of hell and death! I open heaven; and I open hell! I shut them both as I WILL! Through me alone God speaks! Through me alone men shall apply to God. I am on earth what the Almighty is in heaven! Hence I have power to alter what Christ did establish: I can add to his doc-

trines, when it can be made profitable to bring in much gold. I can add as many sacraments as I please to his humble and plain *two*. For this is also profitable,—if not for doctrine, at least for establishing my supreme power over the souls of my slaves and minions, and they also bring much silver and gold to our coffers ; then *gold* brings *might* ; and *might*, according to sound ghostly policy, always makes *right* ! These are the maxims of my court !”

Here the wrath of St Peter was kindled fiercely against him. He had hitherto set him down in his own mind as stark mad, and he had viewed him with pity. But as he went on in detail, he saw that he was a knave, possessed with a legion of raving devils ! “ Who is he ?” said he to his host, “ Verily I know him not ;”—said the horror-stricken chief priest, “ I took him for some of your friends ; then in my mind I thought him a poor demoniac, humbly following in order to get the devil cast out of himself ; he frequently, I thought, mentioned your name and your authority. I suspect he was a noted companion of Judas Iscariot !” “ Who are you ? who sent you, sirrah ?” cried St Peter, addressing him in terms of strong indignation, and unsubduable zeal for God’s glory.

“ Who am I ?” replied he, slowly and solemnly :—“ I am the spouse of the church ; and the church is my chaste and beautiful spouse ;—God’s vicegerent, and the infallible vicar of Christ ; I am come from holy St Peter, the prince of the apostles.”

“ Your proof, sirrah !” said St Peter. “ There is my proof !” said he gravely ; and he held out a roll of parchment : “ I certify this roll to be the true and genuine roll, and deed of right and power, conveyed to me, through lord pope St Peter, from God !”

“ Very well, sir, impostor,” said Peter,—“ you certify for that *roll’s* authenticity ; then, pray, who certifies for *you* ?” “ Why, look you here,—my pity on your weakness, old man ; only inspect this roll, and it will tell all about me, and fully certify that I am the only legal claimant.”

“ And what then, sir knave, will you do, if we ridicule this ludicrous reasoning in a circle ?” said Peter. “ Why, I’ll tell thee, hoary-headed doubter, if any one expresses a doubt, I have the sword, the axe, the fire, and the stake ! like the sword of earthly kings, this is my holy spiritual weapon ; my *ultima ratio* ! my unanswerable argument !

“ What is your object,” replied St Peter ; “ for you are a creature I never to my knowledge saw before,—is it your object to save men’s souls ?” “ That is a *secondary* object.” “ What is your *primary* object then ? You may suppose me to be your St Peter, and tell me.” “ You St Peter !—you a

plain fisherman, St Peter !—why, St Peter wore his red and purple, and fine white robes, and his golden mitre ! Christ made him Prince of the Apostolical College !” “Thou art stark mad, I tell thee,” said St Peter ; “but go on—dost thou set up thy kingdom solely to save men ?” “Yes ; I save them in the way of making a good job of it.” “But now, I pray thee, go on.”

“Why, heaven is a great way off, and the way is very steep, and my flock are not very steady, or moral sometimes.” “Very well,” said St Peter ; “you lead them to the fountain of the Redeemer’s blood, I hope.” “It is far easier, I tell thee, ignorant man, to lead them to a basin of *holy water*.” “Holy water !” cried St Peter ; “I do not know that thing ; and never heard of it before—but do you not teach the holy atonement to be the *only sacrifice* for the sins of man ?” “No, no ; we are inventing a thing called the *mass*, though it will take centuries to get men so well taught, as to leave me all the right of thinking for them ; and then take my bare word for everything ; to call black white, and the Devil Christ, if I only say it !” “*The mass !*” said St Peter ; “that is perfectly new to me ; the Master never said a word of it ; he appointed the holy supper to commemorate his death, and his one real and perfect atonement.

“You know nothing at all,” cried the wild man ; “*We* need not the atonement of Christ ; *we* offer up in the mass daily, a sacrifice for the quick and dead, to appease God !” “Hold in silence thy blaspheming lips,” cried St Peter ; “thou must be *the Antichrist !* But what said you about getting your people near the *far distant heaven ?*” “Why, we make a sacrifice for them ; and what is defective in that we make up by putting the deceased souls into *purgatory* ; and there a smart burning of well applied flames, consumes in a salutary manner all their sins and follies.” “Well, that we know is taken from the abominable heathen ; but you do not mean to say, that it has anything to do with us Christians ? I never taught it ; and the Master never spoke of it ; this he said,—‘The blood of Jesus washes all sins away.’ That is God’s only purgatory that I ever heard of ; for there is no other Saviour than Jesus. But what get you for all this ? Are your holy water, and masses, and purgatory, a free job ?”

“Oh ! no ; we save souls in the way of making gold and silver, and building up our power ! If we condescend to spare the time from our luxuries and pleasures, souls should be very thankful, and pay their fees with less grumbling !” “And as you have added *five* new sacraments,” said St Peter ; “do you bestow grace through them free to all, and *gratis ?*” Oh no ; there is no divine efficacy in one of them, unless the Church’s

dues be paid ; it is the Church's dues ; it is *St Peter's pence* !”

“ So, then, this marvellous and newly invented system is all adapted to make gain—these shepherds shear the sheep, and flay them, and take all the milk to themselves ! I thought that our Master said—‘ Ho ! every one that thirsteth, come drink ; come without money, and without price ;’ God’s word says this.” “ That may be,” said the demon, “ but times shall be changed : these *were* Christ’s laws ; but I speak now of *our Holiness’s* laws.” “ Why, the Master had his children mainly among the poor,” said St Peter ; “ and to the poor is the gospel preached.” “ No, no ; *our* infallibles declare, that the rich can buy pardons for any space,—limited only by the limit of money ; *where that stops short, reprobation begins* ! Know ye not, that the streets of heaven are paved with gold. As we have the laying out of the city, and, of course, *all the paving*, how can we have the paving of gold ready in every street, unless the people give us *their gold* !” “ Marvellously said,” whispered St Peter ; “ now do I see whither we have got ; but repeat what thou saidst about a certain *St Peter*.” “ Why, St Peter was the Prince of the Apostles, infallible, and”—

“ Ah !” cried the Apostle, interrupting him, “ where gottest thou that novelty ?”—“ Aye, Prince he must have been, because he was a blundering, forward man !” “ *Infallible* too !” added the humble Apostle, with deep sorrow ; “ they have got me to be what I never heard of from the Master :—*infallible*, verily ! Ah ! this mockery is offered because I did deny my Lord ! I am humbled and mortified,” continued he ; “ they call *me infallible*, and *Prince*, I suppose, because Paul sternly rebuked me, and showed himself justly my superior ! But, go on,” added he aloud ; “ after this ebullition, what shall we hear next, I wonder ?” “ Why, we select St Peter to be the foundation of our Church.” “ The blessed Master keep me out of such a Church, with such a rotten foundation,” exclaimed St Peter, with holy indignation. “ Give me, O my blessed God, give me grace to belong to that Church that is built on the Rock of eternity, the Lord Jesus Christ ! That is the Christian Church,” cried St Peter : “ And that is the only pure, and immutable Church, which I also long to be a member of,” said the pious chief priest ; “ but, go on ; let us hear all !” “ You know nothing,” cried the demoniac in reply ; “ did I not lay hold of *holy intention* ? Do I not stand up in my sanctified robes ? Am I not, therefore, infallible ? If you doubt, you shall be damned by me ! I will cast you into purgatory ; and none of my holy priests shall pray you out, unless for a ruinous sum from your heirs.”

Here, the Apostle eyeing the motley buffoon from head to foot, burst into a loud laughter ; but suddenly recollecting

himself, he said—"I am determined to hear the possessed madman out. Go on; I will not interrupt thy extravagance: the pagan kings claim power over sun, moon, and stars; but thou art the wild beast whose tail sweeps the third part of the stars from heaven; and with thy paws thou throwest men into sheol! Go on, I pray thee."

"Having laid my foundation of empire on St. Peter, I shall go forth to subdue all nations, kingdoms, tongues, and countries. My power extends to all the world, and all heaven, and all hell."

Here the Apostle sprang up from his seat; he could not stand if. "Nay, then, Sir Gascon, have done at last; I see who thou art. Our sovereign and blessed Master, Jesus Christ, warned us of the great *Western maniac prince*, who would be intoxicated with the blood of the saints. The system was conceived and plotted in hell; and thou art the demon let loose for a season, and charged with the execution of it! Already, I see, art thou wandering to and fro through the earth, and hatching thy diabolical plots. Now, hear me, I *am St. Peter!* and had not the Master drawn the veil over thy mind, thou mightest have known me." Then, by a holy impulse, he laid the glorious system of *the truth of Christ*, as opposed to *the system of Antichrist*, before the vigorous intellect of the mischievous demon. It shone brilliantly, as a polished steel mirror of the daughters of Judah; the truth beamed from it with unutterable brightness, and flashed over his guilty conscience and heart.

The demon, who is the soul and spirit of Antichrist, cast his small, sunk, and twinkling eyes, first on St. Peter, with fear and terror; and then on all the objects around him, exclaiming—"Art thou come, then, to betray in thy Apostolical writings, and those of thy associates, the secret of our kingdom, which I have thoughtlessly blabbed out! Art thou come to torment me and mine before the time?" Then, with a hollow scream, he fainted away under the beams of truth; and a sweeping whirlwind, and vivid flashes of fire, and roaring of thunder—the symbol of heaven's irresistible vengeance—swept him away down the vale into the dead sea!

CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.

The censorship of books originated with the Roman Catholic priesthood. The council of Lateran extended the censure to all kinds of books; the council of Trent confirmed this decree; the Index Expurgatorius is accordingly the catalogue of the works which are proscribed, and which are every where taken from the faithful, and given up to the inquisition.

Dr Doyle, in a pamphlet, entitled "A Vindication of the Religious and Civil Privileges of the Irish Catholics, by I. K. L.," makes the following false statement:—"A committee of the council (that is of Trent,) was appointed to consider and report to the council of the books then in circulation, and what regulation ought to be adopted with regard to them. The report of the committee was not made till the last day of the last or second session; and as the synod could not then discuss the subject of the report, they referred it to the pope. The Index, therefore, or list of books to be prohibited, with the rules annexed, was not sanctioned by the council of Trent, and that which was afterwards published by the pope, and which included such translations of the sacred Scriptures as were not approved of by the proper authorities has not the force of a church law, unless in those countries where it has been published and received."

The reply to this is brief and simple. The council delegated its power to the committee, the committee delegated its power to the pope, and both that pope and his successors, confirming the decision, have exercised that power accordingly.

Let it be noted that the very first book in this list is, "Bacon de Augmentis Scientiarum!" the "Paradise Lost" of Milton, and Locke on the "Human Understanding," follow.

Locke is prohibited by the inquisition, "because the doctrines contained therein destroy the true notions of moral good and evil, leaving men in the state as depicted by Hobbes, Espinosa, and other impious characters, and tend to naturalism and atheism."*

The inquisition likewise prohibited the last six volumes of Condillac's *Cours d'Etudes pour l'Instruction du Prince de Parme*, "because it contains heretical propositions, scandalous ones, tending to disturb public peace, injurious to the high pontiffs and the supreme secular powers. especially to our catholic kings and lords.

* Edict of the Inquisition of Seville, 26th Feb. 1804.

THE
Protestant,

No. X.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19th, 1818.

AT the close of the last number it was stated that the censorship of books originated with the Roman Catholic priesthood. "The inveterate enmity," says Mr White, "of a sincere Roman catholic against books which directly or indirectly dissent from his church, is unconquerable. There is a family in England who, having inherited a copious library under circumstances which make it a kind of heirloom, have torn out every leaf of the protestant works, leaving nothing in the shelves but the covers. This fact I know from the most unquestionable authority.

"This, however, will not for a moment appear wonderful to those who consider that all men are without the pale of popery who presume to exercise their reason in matters of religion. Bossuet says, '*The heretic is he who has an opinion*, for such is the meaning of that word. But what are we to understand by having an opinion? It is the following of our own fancy and particular sentiment. But the catholic is—catholic; that is universal, who, without maintaining any particular sentiment, hesitates not to follow the doctrine of the church.'

"This indeed he does most blindly, (and this is fortunate for his ease and quiet;) for popery, which refuses him the bible in his vernacular tongue, presents to him the vulgate, which is notoriously erroneous; and though the editions of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. are full of contradictory translations, both were ordered to be received by these popes respectively—both are enjoined under a curse.

"Cardinal Toletus asserts 'that if a rustic believes his bishop proposing an heretical tenet for an article of faith, such belief is meritorious.' Cardinal Cusanus tells us, 'that irrational obedience is the most consummate and perfect obedience, when we obey without attending to reason, as a beast obeys his driver.'

The same cardinal further asserts, that 'there are no precepts of christianity but those that are received as such by the church [of Rome.] *When the church changes her judgment, God changes his judgment likewise.*'

"Popery, however, hesitates not to approve, even in the name of God and the whole heavenly host, of any work calculated to promote its interests. Accordingly, the life of Veronica of Burasco by F. Joan Freire, was licensed by the Definidor in Portugal, as a book deserving to be printed, because it had been inspected and reinspected by angels, and approved of by God, (ja visto e revisto pellos anjos, e aprovado por dios.)

"But it would be endless," says Mr White, "to trace all the links, of which the inquisition has formed the chain that binds and weighs down the human mind among us. Acquiescence in the voluminous and multifarious creed of the Roman church is by no means sufficient for safety. A man who closes his work with the O. S. C. S. R. E. (*Omnia sub correctione Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ*) may yet rue the moment when he took pen in hand. Heterodoxy may be easily avoided in writing; but who can be sure that none of his periods *smacks of heresy* (*sapiens hæresim*)—none of his sentences are of that uncouth species which is *apt to grate pious ears* (*piarum aurium offensas*)? Who then will venture upon the path of knowledge, where it leads straight to the inquisition?"

"To expect," continues Mr White, "a rational system of education where the inquisition is constantly on the watch to keep the human mind within the boundaries which the church of Rome, with respect to divines, has set to its progress, would show a perfect ignorance of the character of our religion.

"Popery has debased the fine imagination of Italy. Popery has banished the chivalry of Spain, with the science of her Arab conquerors. Popery has thrown its portion of Germany behind Protestant Germany, as many centuries as Ireland is behind England. Such also has been the case with the respective portions of other countries—of the popish countries of Switzerland compared with the protestant ones, of Savoy compared with Geneva, &c. Popery has moreover bound its iron chain around the hearts of the Irish peasantry, and made them the slaves of an artful and disloyal priesthood.

"In fine, the result of this hatred to knowledge is, that, with the exception of France, every popish state will be found to be behind every protestant state in civilization.—And why is France thus an exception? For this single reason, that the French naturally are by no means a religious people; and that, in that country, religion is an affair only of state or of fashion. The condition of Italy is lower, because notwithstanding the greater natural talent of Italians crushed only by internal division, and

their seeing the papal system so close as to condemn it, still the mass of the people are more popish than the French. The condition of Spain and Portugal is lowest, because they are the slaves of Popery.

Can any one wonder at the uncivilized—the debased state of Popish countries, when he is informed by an excellent observer, that the following is the day of a popish gentleman.

“Every church,” says Mr White, “may be compared to a great school or establishment for religious education. I will represent to you a pupil of that school, that you may infer what is taught in it, and I will draw the picture from various Roman catholics whom I have intimately known.

“Imagine my Romanist friend retiring to his bed in the night.—The walls of the room are covered with pictures of all sizes. Upon a table there is a wooden or brass figure of our Saviour nailed to the cross, with two wax candles, ready to be lighted at each side. Our Romanist carefully locks the door; lights up the candles, kneels before the cross, and beats his breast with his clenched right hand, till it rings again in a hollow sound.

“It is probably a Friday, a day of penance: the good man looks pale and weak, I know the reason—he has made but one meal on that day, and that on fish; had he tasted meat, he feels assured he should have subjected his soul to the pains of hell!

“But the mortifications of the day are not over.—He unlocks a small cupboard, and takes out a skull, which he kisses and places on the table at the foot of the crucifix. He then strips off part of his clothes, and with a scourge, composed of small twisted ropes hardened with wax, lays stoutly to the right and left, till his bare skin is ready to burst with accumulated blood.

“The discipline, as it is called, being over, he mutters several prayers, turning to every picture in the room.

“He then rises to go to bed; but, before he ventures into it, he puts his finger into a little cup which hangs at a short distance over his pillow, and sprinkles with the fluid it contains, the bed and the room in various directions, and finally moistens his forehead in the form of a cross. The cup, you must know, contains holy water, water in which a priest has put some salt, making over it the sign of the cross several times, and saying some prayers, which the church of Rome has inserted for this purpose in the mass book.

“The use of that water, as our Roman Catholic has been taught to believe, is to prevent the devil from approaching the places and things which have been recently sprinkled with it; and he does not feel himself safe in his bed without the precaution which I have described. The holy water has, besides, an

internal and spiritual power of washing away venial sins—those slight sins, I mean, which, according to Romanists, if unrepented, or unwashed away by holy water, or a sign of a cross made by the hand of a bishop, or some other five or six methods, which I will not trouble you with, will keep the venial sinner in purgatory for a certain time.

“The operations of the devout Roman Catholic are probably not yet done.—On the other side of the holy water cup there hangs a frame holding a large cake of wax, with figures raised by a mould, not unlike a large butter pat. It is an *Agnus Dei*, blessed by the pope, which is not to be had except it can be imported from Rome. I believe the wax is kneaded with some earth from the place where the bones of the supposed martyrs are dug up. Whoever possesses one of these spiritual treasures, enjoys the benefit of a great number of indulgences; for, each kiss impressed on the wax gives him the whole value of fifty or one hundred days employed in doing penance and good works, the amount of which is to be struck off the debt which he has to pay in purgatory.

“I should not wonder if our good man, before laying himself to sleep, were to feel about his neck for his rosary or beads, perhaps he has one of a particular value, and like that which I was made to wear next my skin, when a boy. A priest had brought it from Rome, where it had been made, if we believe the certificates, of bits of the stones with which the first martyr, Stephen, was put to death.

“Being satisfied that the rosary hangs still on his neck, he arranges its companion, the scapulary, formed of two square pieces of the stuff which is exclusively worn by some religious order. By means of the scapulary, he is assured either that the virgin Mary will not allow him to remain in purgatory beyond the Saturday next to the day of his death; or he is made partaker of all the penances and good works performed by the religious of the order to which the scapulary belongs.

“At last, having said a prayer to the angel who, he believes, keeps a constant guard over him, the devout Romanist composes himself to sleep, touching his forehead, his breast, and the two shoulders, to form the figure of a cross.

“The prayer and ceremonies of the morning are not unlike those of the night.

“Armed with the sprinkling of holy water, he proceeds to mass. If it happen to be one of the privileged days in which souls may be delivered out of purgatory, you will see him saying a certain number of prayers at different altars. He will repeat his rosary in honour of the virgin Mary, dropping through his fingers either fifty-five or seventy-seven beads, which are strung in the form of a necklace.

“There may be a blessing with the sacrament, which the good catholic will not lose, for the sake of the plenary indulgence which the pope grants to such as are present. On that occasion, you would see him kneeling and beating his breast, while the priest, in a splendid cloak of silk and gold, in the midst of lighted candles and the smoke of frankincense, makes the sign of the cross with a consecrated wafer, enclosed between two pieces of glass set in gold.

“It would, indeed, be an endless task were I to enumerate all the methods and contrivances of this kind recommended by the church of Rome to all her members, and practised by all who are not careless of their spiritual concerns.

“These are facts which no honest Roman Catholic will venture to deny. I therefore ask, whether, since revelation is the only means we have of distinguishing between religion and superstition—between things and acts which really can influence our manner of being when we shall be removed to the invisible world, and fanciful contrivances which there is no reason to suppose connected with our spiritual welfare—I ask whether the whole system of the church of Rome, for the attainment of christian virtue, is not a chain of superstitious practices calculated to accustom the mind to imaginary fear, and fly to the church for fanciful remedies.”

If Popery were Christianity, I should rejoice in its propagation. If the Priests of Rome were employed in showing men the way of salvation by free grace, through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour;—if they were labouring to instruct and edify those who believe in him;—if they were themselves examples of being dead to the things of this world, and alive to those of another;—if they were, in short, like the Apostles of Christ, whose successors they profess to be, I would contemplate no danger, but much benefit to society, from the increase of their number. But every one acquainted with the subject knows, that the reverse of this is the case. Popery is not Christianity, but the counterfeit of it. It is Antichrist; that is, against Christianity. The priests of that religion are not employed in preaching salvation by free grace, but by the merit of men's own doings: they are not labouring to instruct the people, but to keep them in ignorance; and instead of being, like the apostles, dead to this world, and alive to another, their greatest efforts are directed to the things of this world: how they may extort money from their deluded adherents, and how they may promote the reign of ignorance and error. The propagation of this religion, therefore, and the multiplication of its priests, are evils to be depre-

cated as much as the introduction of the plague into the country. They are the pests* of human society; and wherever they shall obtain a footing, farewell to every social and domestic comfort.

But how, it will be asked, can we prevent the increase of Popery? I confess I know no way but that of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people; and forbearing to give any countenance or encouragement to Popish ceremonies and worship. Some will perhaps be surprised that I should speak of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people of a *Christian* country; but their surprise would cease, if they would consider the real state of the people in general, with regard to religious knowledge. They are not all Christians who are called Christians; and those who are Christians only in name, are in the greatest danger of taking up with any counterfeit of Christianity that may be artfully imposed upon them, or that may soothe and quiet their consciences, while they continue to live in sin. Popery is exactly such a religion as persons of this description are prepared to embrace.

Without going further from home, I shall suppose one to make the following experiment: Let him go to the Green of Glasgow, on a Sabbath evening: among the hundreds of men and women whom he will see there, he will not find one in ten who can give him a proper answer to the simple question—What is real Christianity? or, what is the gospel of Christ? Yet these are all Christians in their own esteem, and would be affronted should any one refuse them the name. Let him make a more extensive survey: let him go through all the parishes in Scotland: let him even make his inquiries of the people whom he meets coming from church on a Sabbath-day: he will, no doubt, find among the church-going people more religious knowledge than among those who spend their Sabbath evenings on our Green; but still he will be obliged to come to the conclusion, that the proportion is but small that can tell him what real Christianity is; or, what is the gospel of Christ.

I shall suppose an artful, well-informed Papist, (and many of them are such,) going to our Green on a Sabbath evening, and entering freely into conversation with all he meets: I could venture to assure him, that he would not find one in a hundred who could tell why he is a Protestant, or make any sensible

* Perhaps some will consider this the language of abuse. It is, however, no more than plain truth: and so far as regards the Jesuits, my assertion is confirmed by all the Courts in Europe, who procured the suppression of the order about the middle of the last century. The present Pope has, however, restored it; and the mischievous effects that shall follow, will, no doubt, engage the attention of future historians.

reply to his arguments in support of Popery. Nay more, that I may not be charged with drawing my conclusion from the state of knowledge among the lower classes of society, I shall suppose one going into our coffee-room in the busiest hour of the day, and putting the same questions—What is real Christianity? What is the gospel of Christ? Why are you a Protestant? And I question if one in ten would give a sensible answer, unless it were, that he could not tell.

The melancholy fact is, that a large proportion of our population, of all ranks, are *not Protestants* from a conviction of those truths on which the Protestant religion rests, as opposed to that of Rome: shall I say, *not Christians*, from a belief of that truth on which the Church of Christ is built? Now, with regard to such, they are prepared to go over to Rome, whenever her religion shall become respectable and popular.

I said I know no way of preventing this, but, first, by promoting the knowledge of real Christianity, Let the number of evangelical preachers, be increased; let them be encouraged and supported in preaching the gospel in all parts of the country. Every obstruction thrown in the way of this belongs to Antichrist, and subverts the cause of Popery. The sooner, therefore, it is removed the better. Christ says, “Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to every creature;” and who is that servant of Christ who dares to say, Ye shall not preach the gospel *in my parish*? The preaching of the gospel is the divinely appointed means of turning men from idols to serve the living God: it is, therefore, the means which God has appointed to turn men from Popery, or to preserve them from being deceived by it. The success of some eminent ministers of the Church of Scotland, and of some zealous Dissenters, in preaching the gospel of late years in the Highlands, shows what might be expected from the united exertions of all Christian ministers, accompanied by the divine blessing, which the divine promise warrants them to expect. This, with the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, and the establishment of schools, is the legitimate way of opposing the progress of Popery, and it would ultimately prove effectual.

The second part of my proposal is, to give no countenance or encouragement to Popish ceremonies and worship. Much evil has been done in Glasgow, by the attendance of many of the respectable inhabitants, on Lord’s days, in the Popish Chapel. It has, indeed, become a fashionable lounge for a Sabbath forenoon. Heads of families can without scruple go there, and take their children with them. If one has a friend on a visit from the country, and who must see all that is to be seen in Glasgow, he must of course attend worship in the Popish Chapel. If persons are entire strangers, they cannot go to one of our own

churches, unless they know beforehand where to get a seat, lest they be allowed to stand in the passage: but, in the Popish Chapel, they receive the most polite attention, and are instantly shown into the best seats in the house, especially if they have given silver into the plate.

It is true, many persons go out of mere curiosity, and some of them have told me that they were disgusted with the mummery which they saw, and the nonsense which they heard; but they did not tell this to the people or to the priest. Their presence was taken as a compliment; their money went to support the idolatrous system; and some who would give only a halfpenny to the poor at the door of the parish church, would, for the honour of the thing, give sixpence or a shilling, on entering so fine a house as the Chapel. The consequence of this has been that the Papists here have become more bold in declaring against our religion; and have become more sanguine in their hopes of soon seeing their own prevail. A few years ago, not one of them would have had the effrontery to publish such things against Protestants and the Reformation, as *AMICUS VERITATIS* has done in the Glasgow Chronicle. If Protestants be reviled and insulted by their Popish neighbours, they have themselves to blame. They ought not to have given them such flattering encouragement.

Besides, as Papists look upon theirs as the best of all possible modes of divine worship;—as they adore their own manner of performing divine service, they flatter themselves that all who witness it must also approve,—that they will in due time become admirers, and at last conform to it. Every Protestant, therefore, who honours them by his presence, contributes to confirm them in their delusion; and cherishes in them a hope that, by and by, we shall all return to the communion of the Church of Rome.

But more seriously, I do not know how any Christian can justify himself to his own conscience, after having spent part of the Sabbath in witnessing the mummery of the Popish service. We are taught to pray, “lead us not into temptation;” and to be delivered from the counsel that causes to err from the way of knowledge. But he that voluntarily puts himself in the way of hearing error, cannot, without gross hypocrisy, offer such a prayer to Him who searches the heart.

THE

Protestant,

No. XI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 26th, 1818.

POPERY is the religion of depraved human nature. What Top-lady said of Arminianism is applicable to it. Every man is born a Papist. He is born not only in a state of alienation from God, but with an innate propensity to trust in himself, or in something done by himself, or by fellow-creatures, to obtain the favour, or remove the displeasure, of God. Christianity reveals a Saviour, who has obeyed and suffered in the room of the guilty; who has, in short, done every thing that was necessary to reconcile sinners to their offended Creator: and every sinner who believes in him is so reconciled. This reconciliation, however, is necessarily and invariably accompanied by a radical change in the character, as well as the state of the individual. He becomes a new creature. *He commences a new and spiritual life*;—or, to use the emphatical words of our Saviour, he is *born again*: and without this no man can see the kingdom of God. The future life of such a person is characterized by a hatred of sin, and a daily opposition to it, in all its motions and operations in his own heart, together with a love of righteousness, and an earnest desire to please and serve God. It requires nothing less than the power of the Holy Spirit to produce this change: and nothing short of this will be recognized by the righteous Judge as real Christianity.

But Popery can do very well without any change in either the state or character of persons who submit to the discipline of their ghostly fathers. By the sacrament of baptism, a priest can regenerate a sinner. This is all the change he is taught to seek ;

he is told that by baptism all his sins are taken away, and he is reconciled to God*. By the sacrament of penance, all the sins committed after baptism are forgiven; and by extreme unction, when he comes to die, he is assured of everlasting happiness†; or that, at the worst, he will only be detained some time in purgatory, which will be made as short as possible, if he bequeath a handsome sum to the priests, or if his surviving friend shall pay them for their prayers and masses. All the time, from his baptism till his death, the person is unconscious of any change having taken place in the state of his heart towards God, or holiness. His affections are carnal; he is in love with sin; and he continues to live in it, flattering himself that his soul is safe, because he observes all the prescribed forms of his religion.

It will be granted, that his life is much more miserable than that of the Christian who hates, and is daily striving, against sin. He lives in perpetual bondage, under the discipline of his ghostly fathers, who prescribe fastings, and penances, and pilgrimages, and who never cease their pecuniary exactions. Notwithstanding that his sins are forgiven by baptism and penance, he is taught that he must still do something, or suffer something, to merit heaven, unless he shall pay for indulgences, or for the transference of the good works of the saints to his account.

Miserable, however, as is the condition of such a man, it is that which the carnal mind will prefer to the salvation which the gospel reveals; because it is consistent with the love and practice of sin; it does not require the universal mortification of natural

* “*Quest.* What are the effects of baptism? *Ans.* A total remission of original and actual sin, with the pains due to them. Hence no satisfaction is appointed, when adults are baptized. Again, all spiritual and supernatural gifts are given at the same time. It is an entire regeneration, or new life; it gives a right to all the other sacraments; it opens the gates to heaven; it gives a character, and cannot be reiterated. All these points are defined by the Council of Trent.—*Quest.* Is it lawful to receive baptism twice? *Ans.* No; it is not lawful, on any account, more than once, Heb. vi. ver. 4—6.; and the reason is, because it imprints a spiritual character in the soul, which will remain for ever, either to our great joy in heaven, or our confusion in hell.”—Let my Baptist friends look to their own safety, if Popery shall ever prevail. “*Quest.* What are the penalties of rebaptizing? *Ans.* By the old civil law, it was death: and now, by the canons of the church, it is irregularity, and otherwise punishable.” *The real Principles of Catholics: or a Catechism for the Adult, Dublin, 1750, p. 199.*

† “*Quest.* What are the effects of this sacrament?” (extreme unction) *Ans.* 1st, It remits all venial sins and mortal sins forgotten; 2dly, It remits something of the debt of punishment due to past sins; 3dly, It heals the soul of her infirmity and weakness, and a certain propension to sin, contracted by former sins,” &c. It does other wonderful things, for which I have not room: see the same book, p. 254.

corrupt passions, nor the submission of the heart to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Christ crucified.

It is on this account, that I am concerned for many who are called Protestants. While they do not submit to the plainly revealed way of salvation, by Jesus Christ; while they are trusting for salvation to any thing, or nothing, or are not thinking about the matter, and living in the practice of sin, they are ready to become a prey to the agents of that religion which professes to save sinners, while yet they continue in their hearts without love to God, and without hatred of sin. The sinner has many misgivings of heart, when he thinks of death and judgment, and he will catch hold of any thing that will afford him relief, and soothe his conscience, without requiring a change of heart and conduct. Popery is exactly suited to his wishes; and he will submit to all its impositions and exactions, for the sake of the peace which it affords him. It is, however, a false peace; and it issues in the ruin of all who suffer themselves to be deceived by it.

Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to Popery, and the imposing attitude which that religion now assumes among us? I shall be told, perhaps, that the Protestants I have referred to, are men of no religion at all; and that their becoming Papists will not make them worse than they are. It will not make them worse, perhaps, with regard to their state before God, and their prospects for eternity; but it will make them worse members of society, and more dangerous neighbours. Popery is a stern, exclusive, persecuting religion. It will suffer no other to exist, if it has the power of putting it down. Every addition, therefore, made to their communion, I should consider an accession of strength to the enemies of our civil and religious liberties.

I quote the following from a Popish writer of the present day, to prove that the sentiments of that body, on the subject of persecution, are the same that ever they were; and though it may seem strange, I make the quotation from a passage which contains, in words, a strong, affected disavowal and condemnation of persecution, on account of religion. "For my own part," says this writer, "knowing that the doctrines of my religion teach me to *practise* brotherly love towards *all* my fellow creatures;—knowing that the structure of the Catholic Church is grounded upon the most sublime principles of charity and truth;—knowing that the formation of her constitution is so foreign to despotism, as to become a model for that established form of civil government under which we live;—knowing that *religious* persecution was scarcely ever practised, in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by *Protestants*, at the period of the pretended *Reformation*, with all the refined cruelty which the ingenuity of

passion and malice could invent ;—knowing, that the most barbarous and sanguinary code of laws against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, was invented and enacted by Protestants, and is to be found in the statute books of *England and Ireland, &c.*”—*Orthodox Journal, or Catholic Monthly Intelligencer, for December, 1815.*

I infer, that the sentiments of Papists, with regard to persecution, are the same that ever they were, from these words,—“ *Knowing that religious persecution was scarcely ever practised in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by Protestants, at the period of the pretended Reformation.*” If I knew any means by which it were possible to make a Jesuit speak the truth, I would appeal to the writer of the above passage, Whether it be not his opinion, that violence done to heretics is not persecution? It CANNOT be his meaning, that violence was not done to persons on a religious account, by the agents of the Church of Rome, long before the Reformation. He must know, that those who professed to think differently from his Church, on religious subjects, were slaughtered by thousands and ten thousands, long before the word Protestant was heard of. But this was not persecution. It was a righteous and meritorious work, highly pleasing to the head of the Romish Church ; in evidence of which, see the Pope’s own words in my Second Number, page 7 *. The assertion of this writer, who, I believe, is the Editor of the above Journal, and who, I doubt not, speaks the sentiments of his brethren, as well as of himself, can be true only on the principle, that persecution is that which is done against the adherents of Rome,—not that which is done against Protestants †. Indeed, they consider it a merciful thing to torture heretics out of their errors, for they believe it is impossible that

* What was formerly a meritorious work, in the esteem of the Church of Rome, must be so still, for she is incapable of change ; and, notwithstanding the above apparent disavowal of persecuting principles, and the profession of being taught by their religion to do good to *all* their fellow creatures, it will still be found a righteous thing to drive heretics from their errors, and into the true Church, by force.

† The Rhemish translators of the New Testament, speak the mind of their Church very plainly on this subject. They tell us honestly and openly, that putting heretics, that is, Protestants, to death, is not worse than putting to death thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors. In their note on Rev. xvii. 6. “ *drunken with the blood of saints,*” they say, “ Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries : but their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors ; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer.”

any can be saved, but within the pale of their Church. Papists of the present day will, with one voice, condemn persecution for conscience sake; but they mean only persecution of the Catholic faith; and whenever they become so numerous as to gain the ascendancy, we be to the Protestants who shall be within their reach, or subject to their dominion! Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to Popery in this country, and particularly in this city?

“Every false or corrupt religion is a sanguinary and persecuting religion. It was so with the religion of heathenism; as the character of the heathen wars before Christianity, and of the heathen persecutions after its introduction, sufficiently testifies. Now, such has been remarkably the case with the Romish religion, which, from its earliest period, has been a religion of bloodshed and of bigotry: in proof of which fact, its whole history might be cited, but the present space will only permit the enumeration of a few instances; such as the Papal wars in Italy, fomented and perpetuated by the pretended successors of the Prince of Peace. The civil wars in France, which lasted a whole century, and which are so ably recorded by Davila. The continental wars of Germany, France, and Flanders, as recorded by De Thou. The massacre of St. Bartholemew, in Paris and the provinces, for which the Pope of that day solemnly returned public thanks to Almighty God, in the Cathedral of St. Peter. The Sicilian vespers. The cruelties of the Duke of Alva, and of the Jesuits, in the Low Countries. The horrors which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, by that splended scourge of Europe, Louis XIV. The abominable cruelties of the Inquisition in Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere, from the earliest period of its establishment. The martyrdoms of England, in the reign of Philip and Mary. The appalling conspiracy of the 5th November, and the other sanguinary plots of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. The atrocious and extensive massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, in the reign of Charles I., as recorded by Sir John Temple; and the Irish rebellion, in 1798, whose main object was the extinction of Protestantism, and which was fomented and conducted by the Romish priests, as authenticated by Sir Richard Musgrave. In all these abominable cruelties, the mystical woman of the Apocalypse has trodden in the tract of her heathen precursor; and, in either case, their footsteps have been marked with blood. If modern Rome has not caused her children, like the ancient idolaters, to pass through the fire to Moloch, she has not, on that account, slain fewer in other ways: and sanguinary rites of the ancient superstition have only given place to the immolation of human victims in another form, though

not on a less extensive scale.”—*Preface to the Letters by Ignotus.—From the Times.*

It may be interesting to the reader to know, how the matter stands at present in France, with regard to toleration. If Papists were capable of learning moderation and tenderness, on the subject of religious difference, one should think the kindness which thousands of them received in this country, when driven from their own, would induce them, if not to think well of our religion, at least to tolerate those who profess it. But such is not the case. It seems that this very summer, our Protestant brethren, in France, are exposed to persecution; they are harassed, and brought to trial, and fined, because they will not decorate their houses in honour of the consecrated host that is carried, on certain days, through their streets; that is, because they will not do honour to an idol. They know that the host is an object of worship; they see their deluded neighbours falling down before it; and they believe, that if they were to pay any respect whatever to this idol, they would be guilty of consenting to idolatry; yet they must do so, notwithstanding the constitutional charter which professes to allow perfect freedom, with regard to religious worship, or they must be dragged as criminals before their courts of justice, and fined, as an example to others, and as an earnest of what they may further expect, if they persist in their contumacy. The following information, on this subject, is extracted from the *Philanthropic Gazette*, of the 9th instant, which, I am glad to see, has been published also in the *Glasgow Chronicle*, as I wish the facts to be as extensively known as possible:—

“*Persecution of Protestants at Bourdeaux.*—On Sunday, May 31st, being *Corpus Christi Day*, the several parishes of the city of Bourdeaux went in procession through the streets, preceded by the public crier, who proclaimed the orders of the Mayor to all the citizens, to line the front of their houses, without any regard to the difference of religion. No *arrêté* of the municipal authority, no proclamation whatever, was posted or inserted in the public papers. The citizens, of a religion different from the Roman Catholic, believed, that without a manifest violation of the constitutional charter, they could not be compelled to an act of outward homage, which offered violence to their religious sentiments. From these considerations, several Israelites and Calvinists did not hang out cloth in the front of their houses. The Commissary of Police of that division, in person, ordered several of them to obey. Two of them answered, that, though such an order offered violence to their conscience, and infringed on the liberty of their religious opinions, if he gave them an order, signed by himself, they would submit. This he refused to do, and at the same time noted their disobedience.

" All the citizens who had not complied with the order of lining the front of their houses, were cited to appear, June 12th, before the tribunal of ordinary police : some obeyed the mandate, and others neglected. Those that were present denied the legality of the citation.

" 1st. They alleged that no existing and known law prescribed such an obligation : that the municipal authority had not published, by means of the public prints, any *arrêté*, or ordonnance, relative to the subject ; and that they were ignorant of what had been published by the crier.

" 2d. That they were by profession Calvinists, or Israelites, and that they were forbidden, by their religion, to render any external homage to a religion not their own.

" 3d. That the third article of the charter gave equal liberty to all religions, and granted the same protection to every form of worship ; and that every individual was perfectly free, in regard to his religious duties, nor was obliged to any act contrary to his conscience. The defendants, therefore, demanded to be released from the accusation, asking, at the same time, that their defence should be registered, together with the judgment pronounced, reserving to themselves the right of protesting, &c.

" The commissary of Police, on the side of the prosecution, answered by reading a decision of the Court of Cassation, by which the appeal of a Protestant lady had been rejected. This lady was condemned to pay a fine of six francs, for having refused to *line*, according to a printed order of the Mayor of *Puylaurant*. He maintained, that the Mayor of Bourdeaux had given sufficient notice to his constituents, by the crier, and that no one could justly pretend ignorance. He argued from the ordonnances of the *Jurats*, in 1759, from ancient edicts of the police of Paris, of a date still more remote, and from an article of the law of 7th of August, 1790. Thus, without any reference to the present code, he condemned the defendants to a fine of six francs for those who were present, and fifteen francs for the absentees, with costs.

" It may be proper also to state, that, on the 12th of June, four persons, Israelites, waited on the Mayor again, to request that the procedure might be discontinued. The Mayor refused, stating, that he did not intend to offer violence to the rights of conscience, but that he would abide by the decision of the Court of Cassation. It was answered, that notwithstanding the respect due to the decisions of that Court, the persons who requested his interference would address a petition to the Chamber of Deputies next Session, that the Legislative Body might pronounce on so important a subject, which, as from its nature it belonged to the political, and not to the administrative, was not to be determined

by the Court of Cassation. In the name of many citizens of Bourdeaux.—(Signed) **LANGÉ.**"

Such, it seems, is the state of religious toleration in France, in the year 1818. If a Jew or a Protestant refuse to violate the law of God, that is, if he shall refuse to do honour to an idol, he must pay a fine. It matters not that the fine is a very small sum, six francs being only five shillings sterling, since the principle is admitted, that it is a crime in law not to do honour to the consecrated bread: that is, what they call the real body of Christ, which is carried in solemn procession through the streets on *Corpus Christi*, that is, the Body of Christ Day;—since, I say, the principle is acted upon, that this is a crime, the punishment will not be long continued upon so low a scale, as a fine of five shillings. We shall soon hear of imprisonment, and banishment, and perhaps death, inflicted upon our Protestant brethren, who refuse to do homage to the Popish idol.

The Papists in this country enjoy as much liberty of conscience as other Dissenters. There are no obstructions whatever thrown in the way of their worship. They are not required to conform to any part of the established religion. They enjoy the most ample protection of their persons and property; and any person injuring them would be amenable to our laws, the same as if he had injured any other subject; yet we are told, by the Editor of their *Orthodox Journal*, that the most sanguinary and barbarous code of laws, against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, is to be found in the statute books of England and Ireland! Certainly then they are in the statute books only, and not to be found any where else, at least, they are not to be found in the practice of Protestants towards Papists; whereas, in France, the law is in favour of religious freedom, but the practice is against it. Besides, the principal laws against Papists in England and Ireland have been repealed during his present Majesty's reign; but it did not suit the purpose of the *Orthodox Journalist* to tell this. He wishes the world to believe that his brethren are objects of sanguinary persecution.

I have received several interesting communications, since the commencement of my labours, particularly this week, to which, at present, I can only give this general answer:—My kind and unknown Correspondents are requested to accept my best thanks, and to rest assured, that I will, in due time, make the best use I can of their hints. I am particularly indebted to those who have sent me scarce books, on the subject of this controversy.

THE

Protestant,

No. XII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3d, 1818.

It is time to return to AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes to the Editor of the Glasgow Chronicle thus:—"When I first addressed you, it was far from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth." *Prot. Part I. p. 28.* *Bigot* is a name which Papists are very fond of applying to their Protestant neighbours, while they consider themselves injured when they are called Papists. AMICUS VERITATIS trespassed, he says, upon the Public, merely from "a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious *bigotry*." He "thanks Heaven, the phantoms raised by *bigotry* and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason." *Part I. p. 4.* He asks the PROTESTANT—"Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and *bigotry*? O how shameful and obstinate a thing is *bigotry*! To what end, says Philips, is an argument with the *bigot*?" &c. *Part I. p. 44.*

It is easy calling names, when one is at a loss for arguments. AMICUS VERITATIS knows, that a bigot is an odious thing; and he cannot but know, that it has been pretty generally attached to his own communion. He does, therefore, what he can, to throw it upon the Protestants, and to make it attach to me in particular; thinking, perhaps, that in this way he will get quit of it.

That the reader may be able to judge to whom this word is most applicable, I shall give the definition of it by Dr. Johnson:

M

—“BIGOTRY; prejudice;—unreasonable warmth in favour of party opinions. BIGOTTED; blindly prepossessed in favour of something; irrationally zealous.” Bigotry, it is evident from this, is not warmth and zeal in any thing; or rather, zeal and warmth, and prepossession, are not bigotry; but *unreasonable* warmth,—*blind* prepossession,—*irrational* zeal, are bigotry. I shall not disavow either warmth, or zeal, or prepossession. I confess that my mind was prepossessed, or pre-occupied by certain truths, before I entered upon this controversy. It was prepossessed by a conviction that the word of God is true; that this word is contained in the holy Scriptures; and that these contain all that God has to say to us, till the day of judgment. But this is not bigotry, because it is not *blind* prepossession.—The Bible proves itself to be the word of God, and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe, that what He says is true. Neither shall I acquit myself of zeal, but rather confess that I have not enough of it; but zeal is not bigotry, unless it be irrational. I must also plead guilty to the charge of occasional warmth; but this is not bigotry, unless it be unreasonable. It would ill become me to say I am entirely free from prejudice; but it would be unfair to charge me with it, unless I have advanced something for which I cannot give a satisfactory reason, of which nobody has yet convicted me. As for party opinions, if this is meant for principles founded upon the word of God, I do not disavow being prepossessed in favour of them. In matters of religion, there are, properly speaking, only two parties in the world; and I hope I shall always be found ready to advocate the opinions, or rather the principles, of that party which is on the side of real Christianity, against those of Antichrist; but neither is this bigotry, unless it be done with *unreasonable* warmth.

But it would be no difficult matter to show that, with regard to every part of the definition, a true Papist is a bigot. He is so full of prejudice, that, without reasoning or enquiry, he believes all that his church teaches; and holds it undoubted, that whatever is not taught by his church, must be heresy. This would be reasonable, if it were the result of conviction, from the consideration of sufficient evidence. But with Papists this is not the case. They hold and teach many things, for which no man on earth can give a satisfactory reason. They are, therefore, bigotted in the strongest sense of the word. Their religion is founded upon prejudice, not upon evidence. They are blindly prepossessed in favour of it; they are irrationally zealous in its support and propagation; they are unreasonably warm in their anathemas against those who expose their errors, and who propagate the truth. Papists, undoubtedly, are bigots.

They are extremely zealous, for instance, in maintaining, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that the Pope is his successor. This is blind prepossession ; it is a mere prejudice ; for, as I have shown in my Seventh and Eighth Numbers, Peter never was Bishop of Rome ; and I defy the whole world to produce the shadow of evidence of the fact, from any authentic history. Yet they will part with any thing sooner, than give up this point. They are so blindly prepossessed in favour of it, that rather than renounce it, they would deny the evidence of their own senses. I have before me what is publicly sold in Italy for the Bible. It is a collection of stories, taken from the historical books of the Old and New Testament, and the Apocrypha, with what are called moral reflections. This is all the Bible that is generally circulated among the Italians, in their own language ; at least, that the gentleman whose copy is in my possession, could get to buy when lately in that country ; and great care has been taken that nothing should be contained in it, that is dangerous to the Romish religion ; that is, in short, nothing that can teach a sinner the way of salvation, by Jesus Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. In this work, they profess to give the genealogy of the Popes, from Jesus Christ downward, to the present day, as if that were a matter as certainly known as the genealogy of Christ from Abraham. For the amusement of the reader, I shall give the first century :—

Anni

1 Gesù Cristo Pontifice eterno, secondo l'ordine di Melchisedech, morì l'anno 4 della sua predicazione, e nel 33 con 3 mesi di sua età : elesse per suo successore, e Vicario San Pietro Principe degli Appostoli.

34. S. Pietro Galileo Appostoli	-	-	1
66. S. Lino Toscano	-	-	2
67. S. Clemente Romana	-	-	3
77. S. Clero Romano	-	-	4
83. Anacleto d'Atene, Greco	-	-	5
96. S. Everisto di Betlemme	-	-	6

Thus Jesus Christ is set at the head of the list of Popes ; he is said to have chosen, as his successor and vicar, St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles ; and Peter began his reign in the 34th year of the Christian æra ; that is, in the very year that Christ was crucified. Now, this is downright imposition. Peter is made Bishop of Rome, before there was a Christian in Rome ; Linus is made his immediate successor, and Clement follows Linus ; all which is mere fancy ; yet, it is held forth, by the Church of Rome, as certain ; her members believe it without evidence, and so far as relates to Peter, against the direct evidence of the Apostle Paul, who tells us, that he went to Jerusalem to see Peter three years

after his return from Arabia to Damascus; and fourteen years after that, he found Peter at Jerusalem, with James and John, which must have been above the fiftieth year of the Christian æra. I know it is pleaded, that Peter was occasionally absent from Rome. and particularly, that he went to Jerusalem, to be present at the first general council; but it is unfortunate for the argument, that we read so much of Peter being in other places; but not so much as once within the bounds of his own See. The non-residence of Bishops certainly was not practised so early in the Christian church. It is, in short, not true that Peter was Bishop of Rome; it is not true that he had a successor in office, in Rome, or any where else; yet Papists must believe this; they maintain it most zealously and pertinaciously, for their whole system depends upon it. It is nothing but prejudice,—blind prepossession. Papists then, above all others, are the bigots.

Nothing can be more irrational than transubstantiation, yet they are warm and zealous in maintaining this doctrine, in spite of the evidence of their own senses. What can be greater bigotry?

During nine centuries of the Christian æra, priests were allowed to marry like honest men. It required a miracle to persuade those in England, that it was unlawful for them to have wives*; this miracle is now believed to have been an imposition;

* "In this time the celibacy of the clergy was violently urged, and married Priests thrust from their livings; which raised great stirs in the Church, but the particulars are not recorded, nor the broils which thereon ensued. I read in the *Antiquities of the Britannic Church*, that, in the year 977, a Council was gathered at Calne, in Wiltshire, for that business, to which BEORNALLUS, a Bishop of Scotland, was called by ALFRITHA, the widow of King Edgar, who favoured the cause of married Priests. This Bishop, a man of great learning and eloquence, is said to have defended the conjugal life of Priests, by solid reasons, taken out of Scripture, and to have put all the opposites to silence. But DUNSTAN, the Archbishop, who presided in that Council, when he saw that reason could not bear out the errand, fell a threatening, and said, that, notwithstanding all their arguments, they should not carry away the victory; which he had no sooner spoken, than the beams of the house, wherein they sat at Council, bursting asunder, all were overturned, and fell headlong to the ground; many were bruised, and some killed with the fall: DUNSTAN himself only escaped without harm; the beam whereon he stood remaining whole and entire. Such as favoured the cause of Monks did interpret this accident to be a sentence given by God on their side; others said that DUNSTAN had wrought this mischief by sorcery, for many supposed him to be a magician. However it was, the married Priests (though repining) were forced, indeed, to yield and submit themselves. What became of BEORNALLUS, I read not; nor whether he returned to his own country." *Archbishop Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland*, folio, p. 27. I believe the above accident may be easily accounted for, without either sorcery or a miracle; but it served the purpose of answering the powerful arguments of the Scottish Bishop; and the Priests were compelled to put away their wives.

yet do Papists most zealously maintain the doctrine pretended to have been proved by it; and if any clergyman were to take a wife, he would be rendered incapable of any clerical function;—he would be held guilty of a greater crime than if he had violated all the ten commandments. What foolish prejudice! What bigotry!

The following is an instance of bigotry such as we may look for in vain among Protestants. One of the Dukes of Brunswick took it in his head, in his old age, to forsake the religion in which he had been educated, and to become Papist. He wrote a book to justify his conversion, entitled, “*The Duke of Brunswick’s Fifty Reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic Religion to all other Sects.*” This book has lately been reprinted in Manchester, and is strongly recommended to all who wish to find the true faith. The Duke writes with all the sophistry of a Jesuit; and, having given forty-nine reasons for changing his religion, he gives the following as the last and crowning one. “I observed, that many sectaries, who had seemed for many years to be fixed in their persuasion, were converted towards the end of their days, and desired to die in the Roman Catholic faith. But never did I meet with a Catholic who wished to die in another religion. Now, it is chiefly at the hour of death that the soul opens its eyes into a clearer prospect of things eternal. For my own part, I resolved to live as I should wish to die, and for that reason I came to a resolution to embrace immediately the Catholic faith; because death is as certain, as its hour is uncertain. *Besides that, the Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me, that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves, an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence, I inferred, that the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of those sects that have divided from it.*”

Here is blind prepossession, prejudice, bigotry, with a witness! Here is a man who trusts his salvation on the word of his fellow-creatures, and seems content if they shall be damned in his stead; and, this book is earnestly recommended by Papists of the present day:

I might go over every doctrine and rite of the Romish Church, and on every one of them I could convict her members of bigotry; but, in few words, I ask AMICUS VERITATIS, if he would not rather that all the Popish children in Glasgow, should live and die in ignorance, than that they should be taught by a Protestant school-master? Is not this prejudice, blind, irrational prepossession? Is not this bigotry?

This is the man who had no view in writing, but to put bigotry to the blush, and to advocate the cause of truth: and, poor

Protestants must sit down quietly blushing, and ashamed of their religion. In a tone of great self-sufficiency, he assumes it as indisputable, that the principles of Protestants are "phantoms raised by bigotry and prejudice." This is quite in the style of other Popish writers in the present day. Those of the Orthodox Journal, for instance, assume a lofty tone: they write as if their religion were indisputably the religion of England and Ireland, and as if they considered the Protestants as a sect of mere intruders.

It seems I must submit to the charge of intolerance as well as bigotry. AMICUS VERITATIS asks, if I will "again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry?" I may fairly ask him, What sentiment, bordering on intolerance, has been published by the PROTESTANT? On this point I have made a greater concession in favour of Papists than many of my Protestant brethren will thank me for, and such as no Papist, so far as I know, ever made in favour of Protestants. See *Part I. p. 40*. In fact, I know neither toleration nor intolerance. Neither of the words belongs to the gospel of Christ. Popery, I believe to be in its own nature intolerable, by which I mean, that it ought not to receive any positive encouragement from Christians, any more than the rites of Bacchus, or any other idol. But no man can reasonably infer from this, that I would persecute the votaries of Bacchus, or of Rome. I pity the poor man who wastes his strength and his substance in drunkenness; but still, if his drunkenness does not extend to riot; if he is not guilty of a breach of the peace, I should not think him a fit subject of punishment. I pity also the poor man who worships the Pope, or the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, or who worships the work of his own hands in the consecrated wafer; but still, if he is not guilty of a breach of the public peace, if he does no ill to his neighbour, I should not think him a proper subject of punishment by his fellow creatures. In short I think no weapon can be lawfully used against heretics, or even against the grossest idolaters, but that of persuasion. It belongs to idolatry and to Popery, as such, to use violent means for the conversion of heretics, and for the propagation of their religion.

In my last Number, I gave proof of this by numerous instances of wholesale murder, at the instigation of the Church of Rome, or the Pope as her head, for the purpose of extirpating heretics. I gave the opinion of the learned Doctors of Rheims, who translated the New Testament into English, that putting heretics to death was no worse than shedding the blood of thieves and man-killers. I shall now give the sentiments of modern Papists on the subject of persecution. In my last Number, I quoted a passage from the Orthodox Journal, in which, persecution for con-

science sake was strongly disavowed ; and I gave reasons for believing, that the writer meant only the persecution of his own sect. This is confirmed by the same Journal, in the passage which I am now about to quote. I know it will be objected, that the Orthodox Journal is not the Catholic Church ; and, therefore, Papists are not responsible for its errors. I shall not, therefore, give it as the doctrine of the Church ; but as the opinion of modern Papists ; for bad as it is, it is not by any means so sanguinary as the doctrine and practice of the Church in former times.

Speaking of the right of every man to read the Scriptures, and judge for himself, as to the meaning of their contents, the writer, who subscribes himself CATHOLICUS ROMANUS, proceeds :—
 “ Never did the Church of England commit a greater error, than when it promulgated this absurd tenet. She then struck a dagger in her own heart, which must in the end destroy her. Thousands, every year, are leaving her communion : we find none embracing it. If the Scripture alone is the rule of faith, and every man of common sense a sufficient judge of its meaning, where will fanaticism end ? It is yet in its infancy. When the Lancasterian system has taught the nation to read, and every man is equipped and furnished with his Bible, then will there come forth a swarm of sectaries, preaching new, and, as yet, unheard of doctrines. It has hitherto been a good speculation, where there was all to gain and nothing to lose. A good appearance, and an easy flow of words, is all that is required to make a fortune ; whatever doctrine he chooses to preach, it is of little consequence, provided he proves it by a text ; either side out, like a smuggler’s coat, to delude his followers. Hence, we daily see so many spruce blackcoats, who, the other day, had not a shoe to their feet. It may ill become a Catholic to prop up by his advice the Protestant establishment, otherwise, I should certainly advise them to call in all their Bibles. *Would not, Mr. Editor, some cunning financier do well, if he took advantage of this rage for Bibles, and laid a smart tax upon the reading of it ? Permitting none to read it, without first taking out a licence. And why not tax this as well as other nostrums ?* Or might it not serve as a commutation for the window-tax ? For, if they are determined that the light of Heaven shall be thus obscured by so many contradictory doctrines, we might at least have a little more terrestrial light to illuminate our darkness.” *Orth. Journ. Feb. 1814.*

There is a long series of letters in the same style, in which the Bible Society, and those who support it, are abused as a parcel of fools and knaves ; and, as such sentiments pass unreprieved by the Editor, and without animadversion by any other correspondent, so far as I have seen, they are not to be viewed as merely the sentiments of an individual Papist, but as those of the gene-

ral body in England, of which this Journal seems to be the organ. But the present subject is the persecution which is here recommended against all who shall presume to read the Bible. It is suggested to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to lay a smart tax, or, which in this case would be the same thing, impose a severe fine upon all who shall read the word of God. There could not be more direct persecution for conscience' sake ; and, with regard to the poor, it would be no less than depriving them of the bread of life, and starving their souls by law. What a hue and cry would be raised among Papists, if it were proposed to lay a tax upon their holy water ! What dreadful persecution would this be ! and yet they gravely propose a tax upon the water of life !

The reluctance of popery to commit the bible freely into the hands of the people, is rendered manifest by its recent acts. Two papal briefs, issued by Pope Pius VII. ; the first to Ignatius, archbishop of Gnezn, primate of Poland, dated 29th of June, 1816 ; the other to Stanislaus, archbishop of Mohileff, in Russia, dated 3rd of September, 1816 ; are directed against Bible Societies in those countries. The first says,—“ We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined.”—To remedy this “ pestilence . . . this defilement of the faith, most dangerous to souls . . . we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness.”

The other brief is to the same purpose.

The encyclical letter, however, of Pope Leo XII., on his accession to the pontificate, is still more remarkable. “ You are aware,” he says, “ venerable brethren, that a certain society, commonly called the Bible Society, strolls with effrontery throughout the world ; which society, contemning the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the council of Trent, labours with all its might, and by every means, to translate—or rather to pervert—the holy bible, into the vulgar languages of every nation ; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages, may occur with regard to others ; to wit, ‘ that, by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or, what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil.’ ”

THE

Protestant,

No. XIII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10th, 1818

AMICUS VERITATIS accuses me of both bigotry and intolerance. In my last Number, I endeavoured to show, that such terms belong more properly to the adherents of Rome. I convicted them of bigotry, inasmuch as they are blindly prepossessed in favour of a system, and irrationally zealous in maintaining it, not only without evidence, but against the evidence of the word of God, and of their own senses. With equal ease, I can convict them of intolerance. Popery is, and always has been, a persecuting system: and though it cannot be denied, that some Protestants have also been persecutors, yet it can easily be shown, that they learned to be so from Rome, and continued to be so, because they had not renounced the whole of Rome's abominations.

I intend, in the present Number, to prove the Church of Rome guilty of intolerance and persecution, notwithstanding the assertion of the Orthodox Journal, that persecution for conscience sake was scarcely known in any Christian country, till it was introduced by Protestants; and I shall take the word *persecution* in the sense in which it is commonly understood in this country; not in the sense in which it is now used by Papists, who use it only to denote what is done against themselves.

Early in the twelfth century, a great number of persons in Lyons, and other parts in the south of France, had their eyes opened to perceive the idolatry and absurdity of the Romish worship. They laboured for a long time under many disadvantages. The Vulgate Latin Bible was the only edition of the

Scriptures at that time in Europe; and very few of the people were capable of reading it. We may well suppose, then, that their knowledge of divine things was very scanty; but nobody can tell how small the degree of knowledge is, by which a sinner may be saved, if it be but the knowledge of Christ. Multitudes, who were called the poor men of Lyons, had obtained that knowledge, and were enabled to maintain the truth, at the expense of being hated and persecuted by their neighbours.

Providence raised up one among them, who was highly honoured as an instrument of extensively propagating those truths which were, three hundred years after, embraced by Luther and his colleagues, at the time of the Reformation. This was PETER WALDO, a rich merchant of Lyons, from whom it is supposed, the Waldenses took their name. Having had a better education than most of his neighbours, he was able to teach the people the text of the New Testament, in their mother tongue. Here he saw clearly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, and found peace and comfort to himself. He was desirous of communicating to others the knowledge of that truth which he found to be to his own salvation. He abandoned his mercantile pursuits, distributed his wealth to the poor, as occasion required; and, while the latter flocked to him, to partake of his alms, he laboured to engage their attention to the things which belonged to their everlasting peace. He either translated, or procured to be translated, the four Gospels into French; and had the honour of being the first who gave the word of God in any modern language of Europe.— See this subject, more in detail, in *Jones' History of the Waldenses*, 2d Ed. chap. v. §. 1.

WALDO laboured incessantly in propagating the truth, and in demonstrating the great difference there was between the Christianity of the Bible, and that of the Church of Rome. "The Archbishop of Lyons heard of these proceedings, and became indignant. Their tendency was obvious; the honour of the Church was involved in them; and in perfect consistency with the usual mode of silencing objectors among the Catholic party, he forbade the new Reformer to teach any more, on pain of excommunication, and of being proceeded against as an heretic."— WALDO replied, "that though a layman, he could not be silent in a matter which concerned the salvation of his fellow creatures." "Information of these things was then conveyed to Pope Alexander III. who no sooner heard of such heretical proceedings, than he anathematized the Reformer and his adherents, commanding the Archbishop to proceed against them with the utmost rigour." He was now compelled to leave Lyons, and afterwards, "persecuted from place to place he retired into Picardy, where also success attended his labours. Driven from

thence, he proceeded to Germany, carrying along with him the glad tidings of salvation ; and, according to the testimony of Thuanus, a very authentic French historian, he at length settled in Bohemia, where he finished his course, in the year 1179, after a ministry of nearly twenty years." *Hist. Wald. vol. ii. p. 12.*

Attend now to the intolerant spirit of the Popish religion, and the cruelties exercised upon the followers of PETER WALDO ;—The doctrines which he had taught, which were evidently those of the Gospel, spread extensively in Alsace, along the Rhine, and in many other places. " Persecutions ensued—thirty-five citizens of Mentz were burned in one fire, at the city of Bingen, and eighteen in Mentz itself. The bishops of both Mentz and Strasburgh breathed nothing but vengeance and slaughter against them ; and, in the latter city, where WALDO himself is said to have narrowly escaped apprehension, eighty persons were committed to the flames. In the treatment and in the behaviour of the Waldenses, were renewed the scenes of martyrdom of the second century. Multitudes died praising God, and in the confident hope of a blessed resurrection." *Ibid. p. 13.*

That these cruelties were inflicted, not on the mere authority of individual bishops, but on the authority and at the instigation of the Pope of Rome, as head of the Church, appears by a decree of Pope LUCIUS III. against heretics, A. D. 1181, which commences thus :—" To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies, which are lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the Church should be awakened, that, by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and mal-pertness of the heretics, in their false designs, may be crushed, and the truth of Catholic simplicity shining forth in the holy Church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son, FREDERICK, the most illustrious Emperor of the Romans, always increaser of the empire, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other patriarchs, archbishops, and many princes, who, from several parts of the world, are met together, do set themselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines which they profess, by the sanction of this present decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

" More particularly, we declare all Catharists, Patorines, and those who call themselves the Poor of Lyons ; the Passagines, Josephites, Arnoldists, to be under a perpetual anathema. And because some, under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the Apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority

of preaching; whereas the same Apostle saith, "How shall they preach, except they be sent?"—we therefore conclude, under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema, all those who either being forbid, or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received from the Apostolic See, or from the bishops of their respective dioceses," &c. &c. Thus, by authority of the holy father, the Emperor of the Romans, and many princes from different parts of the world, any man who shall tell his neighbour about salvation by Jesus Christ, however privately, is subjected to a perpetual curse: and the decree proceeds:—"As for any layman, who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, (that is, preaching, or speaking improperly of the sacraments,) unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately return to the orthodox faith, we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of the offence." *Hist. Wald. vol. ii. p. 15, 16.* This of giving over to the secular judge, was well understood to infer certain death, often accompanied by the most cruel tortures that the ingenuity of men could invent.

ILDEFONSUS, King of Arragon, followed up this decree of the Pope, by one of his own, in 1194, in which he ordains that all heretics, found in his dominions, "be condemned and persecuted every where;" that any persons who should receive any of them into their houses, or "be present at their pernicious sermons," shall "be punished, as if they were actually guilty of high treason." The Emperor FREDERICK II. published a similar edict, with regard to those in his dominions. "The care of the imperial government," says his Majesty, "committed to us from heaven, and over which we preside, demands the material sword, which is given to us separately from the priesthood, against the enemies of the faith, and for the extirpation of heretical pravity, that we should pursue with judgment and justice, those vipers and perfidious children, who insult the Lord and his Church, as if they would tear out the very bowels of their mother. We shall not suffer these wretches to live, who infect the world by their seducing doctrines, and who, being themselves corrupted, more grievously taint the flock of the faithful." In another edict, the Emperor accuses them of savage cruelty to themselves; "since, besides the loss of their immortal souls, they expose their bodies to a cruel death, being prodigal of their lives, and fearless of destruction, which, by acknowledging the true faith they might escape, and, which is horrible to express, *their survivors are not terrified by their example.* Against such enemies to God and man, we cannot contain our indignation, nor refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance, but shall pursue them with so

much the greater vigour, as they appear to spread wider the crimes of their superstition, to the most evident injury of the Christian faith, and of the Church of Rome, which is adjudged to be the head of all churches." *Page 94—97, 2d vol. Jones, who refers to the first vol. of Limborch's History of the Inquisition where the edicts are to be found entire.*

The whole power of the Romish Church, clerical and laical, was mustered against these unoffending people, whose only crimes were presuming to read and understand the word of God for themselves, and refusing to believe all the nonsense which was taught by the Romish priests. The latter were constantly employed in preaching up crusades against them. Their favourite text was Psalm xciv. 16. "Who will rise up for me against the evil doers? or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?" and the application of their sermons usually ran in the following strain:—"You see, most dear brethren, how great the wickedness of the heretics is, and how much mischief they do in the world. You see, also, how tenderly, and by how many pious methods, the Church labours to reclaim them. But with them they all prove ineffectual, and they fly to the secular power for their defence. Therefore, our Holy Mother, the Church, though with great reluctance and grief, calls together against them the Christian army. If then you have any zeal for the faith; if you are touched with any concern for the glory of God; if you would reap the benefit of this great indulgence, come and receive the sign of the cross, and join yourselves to the army of the crucified Saviour." The Pope had despatched preachers throughout all Europe, to entice men to engage in this holy warfare. He promised paradise, and the remission of all their sins, to those who should serve forty days, which, I suppose, is what is meant by the "great indulgence" mentioned above. After telling them that "they were not to keep faith with those who do not keep faith with God," he thus proceeds:—"We exhort you, that you would endeavour to destroy the wicked heresy of the Albigenses, and do this with more rigour than you would towards the Saracens themselves; persecute them with a strong hand; deprive them of their lands and possessions; banish them, and put Catholics in their room." I shall not torture my readers with the horrible details into which this subject would lead me. It is enough to say, that, by fire and sword, the armies employed by Pope Innocent III. murdered above two hundred thousand, in the short space of a few months.

For many years, the work of extirpating heretics was continued, at the instigation of the Pope, who commanded the princes who were subject to him; that is, all the princes in Christendom, to kill, to destroy, and cause to perish, all who presumed to differ,

in any point of religion, from the doctrine of the Church of Rome. To Louis, King of France, he says,—“ ’Tis the command of God, who says :—‘ If thou shalt hear say in any one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known, thou shalt smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword.’ Although you are under many obligations already to God, for the great benefits hitherto received from him, from whom comes every good and perfect gift, yet you ought to reckon yourself more especially obliged courageously to exert yourself for him, against the subvertors of the faith, by whom he is blasphemed, and manfully to defend the Catholic purity, which many, in those parts, adhering to the doctrines of devils, are known to have cast off.”

Louis was very ready to obey the command of his ghostly father, by raising an army to destroy the heretics ; but he was afraid the King of England would invade his territory, while he was employed in so godly a work. The Pope, therefore, endeavours to keep the English monarch at home, by writing to him as follows :—“ Make no war, either by yourself, or your brother, or any other person on the said king, so long as he is engaged in the affair of the faith and service of Jesus Christ, lest by your obstructing the matter, which God forbid you should do, the king, with his prelates and barons of France, should be forced to turn their arms from the extirpation of heretics, to their own defence.”

In short, it seems as if the whole soul of the Pope, and of all his clergy, and of all the princes under his control, had been directed to this one object :—the murdering of those who received their religion directly from the word of God. The Waldenses and Albigenses were a simple harmless people ; they professed no principles, and were convicted of no practices, hostile to the good order of society. Their very enemies bear ample testimony on behalf of their manner of life, as being more moral than that of those who persecuted them. Even an inquisitor, who wrote against them, says,—“ These heretics are known by their manners and conversation ; for they are orderly and modest in their behaviour and deportment. They avoid all appearance of pride in their dress, they neither indulge in finery of attire, nor are they remarkable for being mean or ragged. They avoid commerce, that they may be free from deceit and falsehood. They get their livelihood by manual industry, as day labourers or mechanics, and their teachers are weavers or tailors. They are not anxious about amassing riches, but content themselves with the necessities of life. They are chaste, temperate, and sober. They abstain from anger. Even when they work, they either learn or teach. In like manner also, their women are very modest ; avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, and levity of speech, especially abstaining from lies

or swearing, not so much as making use of the common asseverations, “in truth,” “for certain,” or the like; because they regard these as oaths—contenting themselves with simply answering, “yes,” or “no.”

CLAUDIUS SEISSELIUS, Archbishop of Turin, says, “that, their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians.”—“In their lives and morals,” says he, “they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves, with all their might, to the service of God.” Yet this prelate wrote against them, and joined in persecuting them, because they would not submit to all the absurdities and impieties of Rome.

LIELENTENTIUS, a Dominican, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says,—“I say, that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love; but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shown in my treatise. SAMUEL DE CASSINI, a Franciscan friar, speaking of them in his “*Victoria Trionfale*,” explicitly owns in what respect their faith was incorrigible and vile, when he says, “that all the errors of these Waldenses consisted in this, that they denied the Church of Rome to be the Holy Mother Church, and would not obey her traditions.”

In the time of a great persecution of the Waldenses of Merindol and Provence, a certain monk was deputed by the Bishop of Cavaillon, to hold a conference with them, that they might be convinced of their errors, and the effusion of blood prevented. But the monk returned in confusion, owning that in his whole life he had never known so much of the Scriptures as he had learned during those few days that he had been conversing with the heretics. The Bishop, however, sent among them a number of doctors—young men, who had lately come from the Sorbonne, which, at that time, was the very centre of theological subtilty at Paris. One of these publicly owned, that he had understood more of the doctrine of salvation, from the answers of the children in their catechisms, than by all the disputations that he had ever before heard.

Such was the character of those who professed the doctrines of the Reformation, long before the Reformation took place; and this is the character which their enemies gave them. Undoubtedly, then, they were the Church of Christ,—they were the followers of the Lamb,—they were the saints of God; and the Church of Rome became drunk with their blood—intoxicated with rage against them, and by success in destroying them. The details of the murderous warfare which was carried on against them, for more than three centuries, are the most horrible that can be imagined. I shall give only one instance of the manner in which they were treated. It is by no means the worst, but, I believe, it is as bad as any of my readers will be able to bear :—

“ About the year 1400, a violent outrage was committed upon the Waldenses, who inhabited the valley of Pragella, in Piedmont, by the Catholic party resident in that neighbourhood. The attack, which seems to have been of the most furious kind, was made towards the end of the month of December, when the mountains were covered with snow, and thereby rendered of difficult access, that the peaceable inhabitants of the valleys were wholly unapprized that any such attempt was meditated; and the persecutors were in actual possession of their caves, ere the former seem to have been apprized of any hostile designs against them. In this pitiable plight, they had recourse to the only alternative which remained for saving their lives—they fled to one of the highest mountains of the Alps, with their wives and children, the unhappy mothers carrying the cradle in one hand, and in the other leading such of their offspring as were able to walk. Their inhuman invaders, whose feet were swift to shed blood, pursued them in their flight, until night came on, and slew great numbers of them, before they could reach the mountains. Those who escaped were, however, reserved to experience a fate not more enviable. Overtaken by the shades of night, they wandered up and down the mountains, covered with snow, destitute of the means of shelter from the inclemencies of the weather, or of supporting themselves under it by any of the comforts which Providence has destined for that purpose: benumbed with cold, they fell an easy prey to the severity of the climate, and when the night had passed away, there were found in their cradles, or lying upon the snow, fourscore of their infants deprived of life, many of the mothers also lying dead by their sides, and others just upon the point of expiring.”

This was the work of the holy Roman Church, and a thousand such things she has done. It was done by authority of the head of the Church, with the concurrence of his prelates and patriarchs, and by the agency of kings and princes, who degraded themselves, by becoming the common executioners of the ghostly father of Rome. I should not bring such things against Papists of the present day, if they would honestly say, that they condemn the conduct of the head of the Church, for such barbarous proceedings. But they will do no such thing. I never heard of one of them who would say that the Pope had done wrong, in commanding the slaughter of so many thousands of men, women, and children, for the sake of religion. I hold them all, therefore, guilty of consenting to the bloody work of their fathers; and it is not unfair to infer that, if they were placed in the same circumstances, and had the same power over heretics, their conduct would be the same.

THE

Protestant,

No. XIV.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17th, 1818.

IT was not till towards the end of the eleventh century, that the Church of Scotland was brought into full conformity with that of Rome. The simplicity of the Culdean mode of worship was preferred by our fathers for ages after other countries in Europe, not excepting England, had submitted to the superstitious and ridiculous mummeries of the Romish Church. This simplicity of worship was called barbarism, by the Popish writers of those days; as, I believe, our mode of worship is esteemed barbarous still, by those who prefer the Popish ritual. Margaret, Queen of Malcolm Canmore, who has been canonized as the patroness of Scotland, was the instrument of bringing the Church to a nearer conformity with Rome, both in doctrine and worship. She was an Anglo-Saxon princess, and having been educated on the Continent, where she had been accustomed to witness the same pompous rites, she was much offended by "certain erroneous practices," which prevailed in the Scottish Church. She was at great pains to annihilate those barbarous rites which were contrary to the universal practice of the Church. Her arguments at length prevailed. The people were persuaded to keep Lent at the proper time, to celebrate Mass in the proper manner, and, I suppose, to become in every respect good Christians, according to the will of the Queen. It would appear, however, that, after her death, many relapsed to their former "beastly rites," as a Popish saint was pleased to denominate the simple worship of the Culdees.

In the twelfth century, it is affirmed, by Popish writers, there were Waldenses to be found both in England and Scotland, so that the thick darkness of Popery did not rest long upon our highly favoured country, without being relieved by a few rays of heavenly light. "In the year 1160, some real Christians sought in Britain an asylum from the persecutions of Germany. But, alas! they found only a premature grave. Regarding them as contemptible heretics, the writers of these times record their history in a way so cursory and confused, that it is difficult to ascertain facts. It is, however, confessed that the leader of these refugees, whose name was Gerard, was neither ignorant nor illiterate, though we are told his followers were, because, it seems, they made no other reply to the cavils of their enemies, than, "we believe as we are taught in the word of God." These simple people received such treatment from the Popish rulers in England, as their brethren did in Germany and France. A council was called by the king, to meet at Oxford, to try these heretics, whose number, it seems, amounted to no more than thirty. They were not likely to meet with either mercy or justice, from an assembly of haughty prelates. They were condemned—branded on the forehead—publicly whipt out of the town—and, being turned into the fields, in the depth of winter, when all were forbidden to relieve them, they perished. Even their enemies allow, that they behaved with great calmness and moderation; and when the inhuman sentence was executed upon them, they sang, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and persecute you." WARNER justly observes, that "their conduct was worthy of the best and most righteous cause, and would incline one to think favourably of their doctrine." These were probably the first martyrs in Britain, for pure Christianity; at least, the first that suffered from the Church of Rome. What now shall we think of the assertion of modern Papists, that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till it was practised by Protestants? The fact is, wherever there appeared the smallest symptom of any person being about to form his own judgment on matters of religion, from the word of God, he was considered a fit subject for the fire, and such is the hardening influence of Popery, upon the hearts of people otherwise humane, that it renders them perfectly insensible of the miseries of fellow creatures; it makes them even delight in inflicting tortures, if it be only for the sake of the faith. England, in the twelfth century, was not a country of savages. Considerable progress had been made in civilization; but it was a land of Papists; and, therefore, thirty poor strangers, who sought an asylum among them, and who were guilty of no crime, but professing to believe what they were taught in the word of God, were branded, and whipt, and with their bodies thus lacerated

they were driven from the abodes of men, and left to perish of hunger and cold, in the depth of winter ! The above fact is related by Bogue and Bennet, who refer to Warner's *Ecc. Hist.*—Petries' *Ecc. Hist.* and Gillies' *Collections*."

The Popish writers affirm not only that the Waldenses were found in England and Scotland, but they mention Wickliffe as one of their followers ; and every reader of history knows what he and those who embraced pure Christianity suffered from their Popish rulers. Through the powerful influence of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, Wickliffe was indeed saved from the fury of his persecutors, and suffered to die a natural death ; but the Council of Constance, which burned John Huss, condemned Wickliffe as a heretic ; and by its order his bones were dug up and burnt, and the ashes thrown into a neighbouring brook. This deed of impotent rage was the deed of the holy church in council assembled ; and is therefore chargeable upon the church herself, and not upon any individual bishop or king.

At Glasgow, in the year 1422, James Retby was burnt for denying that the Pope was Christ's Vicar. I have no doubt many suffered before this date ; but Retby is the first that remains on record, and he is mentioned by Knox, whose *History* commences at this year ; and begins with remarkable extracts from the records of Glasgow. The historian observes " that it was by the merciful providence of God that such things, as are after-mentioned, were kept even by the enemies of truth, in their registers, to show that God preserved, in this realm, some sparks of his light, even in the time of the greatest darkness." In 1431, Paul Craw, a Bohemian, apprehended in the University of St. Andrews, suffered death there. His enemies put a ball of brass in his mouth, that what he said for the truth, might not instruct the people. Wickliffe is said to have received the knowledge of the truth from one Lollard ; hence, those who embraced the same sentiments were called Lollards, and they appear to have been numerous in both parts of the island, before the end of the fifteenth century. In the year 1494, thirty persons of those called the Lollards of Kyle, (that is, part of Ayrshire) were accused before Blackadder, Archbishop of Glasgow, of about thirty-four articles contrary to Popish errors. Among these Lollards were George Campbell of Cesnock, Adam Reid of Bars-Kimming, John Campbell of New Mills, Andrew Shaw of Polkennet, Helen Chamber Lady Pokellie, and Isabel Chamber Lady Stair. Archbishop Spotswood informs us what sort of errors were held by those Lollards of Kyle, of which the following are a specimen :—That images ought not to be made or worshipped ;—that the relicks of saints ought not to be adored ;—that it is not lawful to fight for the faith ;—that after the consecration of the mass there remaineth

bread, and that the natural body of Christ is not there;—that every faithful man and woman is a priest;—that the Pope is not the successor of Peter, except in that which our Saviour spoke to him, “Go behind me, Satan;”—that the Pope deceives the people with his bulls and indulgences;—that the mass profiteth not the souls in purgatory;—that the Pope exalts himself above God, and against God;—that priests may have wives, &c. The Archbishop of Glasgow laying these things to the charge of the above persons, they answered all with such confidence, that it was thought best to demit them, with an admonition to take heed of new doctrines, and content themselves with the faith of the Church. The Archbishop’s accusation is said to have been very grievous, yet God so assisted his servants, partly by inclining the King’s heart to gentleness, for several of them were his familiar friends, and partly by enabling them to give bold and godly answers to their accusers; so that, in the end, the enemies were frustrate in their purpose. Adam Reid, in particular, gave such answers as turned the cause of the persecutors into ridicule, in the presence of the court where the King presided.”—See *Spotswood and Gillies’ Hist. Coll.*

Those worthy persons of Ayrshire thus escaped the fury of their persecutors; but no thanks to the Archbishop of Glasgow, or to the Church of Rome, who would gladly have had them all at the stake. Considering the articles laid to their charge, one is astonished that they should have acquired so much spiritual light in an age of darkness, while yet the Bible had not been printed in their language, and Wickliffe’s translation in manuscript must have been possessed by few of them.

Blackadder was not the only Archbishop of Glasgow, who distinguished himself as a persecutor. Spotswood remarks of Beaton, who was translated to St. Andrews, “that herein he was most unfortunate, that, under the shadow of his authority, *many good men* were put to death for the cause of religion, though himself was neither violently set, nor much solicitous (as it was thought) how matters went in the Church.” I cannot sustain this apology of the Scottish Protestant Primate on behalf of his Popish predecessor. If good men were put to death under his authority, he was undoubtedly their murderer; and that he was not solicitous how matters went in the church, only presents his character in a light so much the worse. He was a Papist, however, and I believe not worse than the average of Popish bishops,—he would rather have seen half the nation brought to the stake and burnt than that one man should be allowed to read the Bible, and form his own judgment of its contents.

It is not my intention to write an ecclesiastical history; nor do I intend to narrate all that our fathers suffered, on account of re-

ligion from Papists, and men popishly inclined. If such were my intention, I could not flatter myself, or my readers, with the prospect of a termination of my labours in less than seven years. I must be indulged, however, in relating one or two instances, to show the true spirit of Popery, and what may be expected if that system shall again obtain the ascendancy.

Of the "many good men" that suffered death under Archbishop Beaton, Archbishop Spotswood says,—“The first that was called in question, was Mr. Patrick Hamilton, Abbot of Ferm, a man nobly descended, for he was nephew to the Earl of Arran, by his father, and to the Duke of Albany, by his mother, and not much past twenty-three years of age. This young man had travelled in Germany, and falling in familiarity with Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Francis Lambert, and other learned men, was by them instructed in the knowledge of true religion, in the profession whereof he was so zealous, as he was resolved to come back into his country, and communicate the light he had received, unto others. At his return, wheresoever he came, he spared not to lay open the corruptions of the Roman Church, and to show the errors crept into Christian religion; whereunto many gave ear, and a great following he had both for his learning and courteous behaviour to all sorts of people. The clergy grudging at this, under colour of conference, enticed him to the city of St. Andrews; and when he came thither, appointed friar Alexander Campbell, to keep company with him, and to use the best persuasions he could to divert him from his opinions. Sundry conferences they had, wherein the friar, acknowledging that many things in the Church did need to be reformed, and applauding his judgment in most of the points, his mind was rather confirmed than in any sort weakened. Thus having stayed some few days in the city, whilst he suspected no violence to be used, under night he was apprehended, being in bed, and carried prisoner to the castle; the next day he was presented before the Bishop, accused of maintaining the articles following.”—These are substantially the doctrines of the Reformation. Confessing that he held some of them as undoubted, and others as disputable, he was put to trial,—condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular judge. “The same day, (for the execution was hastened, lest the King, who was gone at that time in pilgrimage to St. Duthac, in Ross, should impede the proceeding,) he was condemned by the secular judge, and, in the afternoon led to his place of suffering, which was appointed to be at the gate of St. Salvator’s college. Being come to the place, he put off his gown, and gave it, with his bonnet, coat, and other apparel to his servant, saying, this stuff will not help in the fire, yet will do thee some good; I have no more to leave thee but the ensample of my

death, which I pray thee keep in mind. For albeit the same be bitter, and painful in man's judgment, yet is it the entrance to everlasting life, which none can inherit, who denieth Christ before this congregation. Then was he tied to the stake; about it a great quantity of coal, wood, and other combustible matter was heaped, whereof he seemed to have no fear, but seriously commending his soul into the hands of God, held his eyes fixed towards heaven. The executioner firing the powder that was laid to kindle the wood, his left hand and the side of his face were a little scorched therewith, yet the fire did not kindle. Whereupon some were sent to the castle to bring more powder; whilst this was bringing, he uttered divers comfortable speeches to them that stood by: the friars all that time molesting him with their cries, bidding him convert, pray to our lady, and say *Salve Regina*: amongst them none was more troublesome than friar Alexander Campbell, who, as we said, kept company with him, at his first coming to the city. Often he besought him to depart, and not to vex him; but when he would not cease his crying, he said, wicked man, thou knowest that I am not a heretic, and that it is the truth of God for which I now suffer; so much thou didst confess to me in private, and, therefore, I appeal thee to answer before the judgment-seat of Christ.

"The powder by this time was brought, and the fire kindled, after which, with a loud voice he was heard to say, how long, O Lord, shall darkness oppress this realm? how long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of men? and then closed his speeches with these words, Lord Jesus receive my spirit. His body was quickly consumed, for the fire was vehement, but the patience and constancy he showed in his dying stirred up such compassion in the beholders, as many of them doubted not to say that he suffered an innocent, and was indeed a martyr of Christ."

It became, however, a capital crime to say that Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and some suffered death for it. According to Spotswood, "one Henry Forrest was delated for saying that Mr. Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and thereupon was brought to St. Andrew's; but, because the probation was not clear enough, friar Walter Lainge, was appointed to confess him. The simple man that feared no harm, being asked by the friar, what was his judgment of Mr. Patrick, answered, that he esteemed him to be a good man, and that the articles for which he was condemned, might well be defended. This confession, revealed by the friar, was taken for sufficient evidence, and the poor man was condemned to be burnt as a heretic. As he was leading out to be degraded, he complained grievously of the friar who had betrayed him, crying out, fie on falsehood, fie on false friars, revealers of confession. Never let any man trust them after me. They are

despisers of God, and deceivers of men. And when they were taking from him his orders, (for he was of the order of Bennet and Collet, as they used then to speak) he cried aloud, take not only your orders from me, but your baptism also. So being carried to the place of execution, (which was appointed to be at the north stile of the Abbey, to the end the heretics of Angus might see the fire) he suffered death most constantly. Whilst they were consulting upon the manner of his execution, one John Lindsay, a plain and simple man who attended the Bishop, gave advice to burn him in some hollow cellar ; for the smoke, saith he, of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected all those on whom it blew.

“ Yet the persecution still proceeding, divers were cited to appear at *Halirudhouse*, by James Hay, Bishop of Ross, who sat as commissioner for the Archbishop of St. Andrews; amongst others, James Hamilton of Livingston, brother-german to Master Patrick, with Catherine Hamilton, his sister. The gentleman was advised by the King, secretly, (for he loved the man) not to appear, and was for his contumacy condemned. His sister appearing, and questioned upon the point of justification by works, answered simply, that she believed no person could be saved by their works. Master John Spence, the lawyer, held a long discourse with her about that purpose, telling her that there were different sorts of works, works of congruity, and works of condignity; in the application whereof, he consumed a long time. The woman growing thereupon into a chafe, cried out, ‘ work here, work there, what kind of working is all this? I know perfectly, that no works can save me but the work of Christ my Saviour.’ The king was present all the time, and laughed heartily at the answer, yet, taking the gentlewoman aside, he moved her to recant her opinions, and by her example divers others at the same time abjured their profession.” How honourably would this lady have appeared in history, had she been burnt at the stake as her brother was, instead of being prevailed upon by the king to make shipwreck of the faith.

I shall, at present, give only one instance more of Popish cruelty and intolerance. It happened in our own city, in 1538: “ This year, in Glasgow,” says Spotswood, “ Hieronymus Russel, of the order of Grey Friars, and one Kennedy, a young man of Ayr, not past eighteen years of age, were accused likewise of heresy, but because the Archbishop, Mr. Gavin Dumbar, was esteemed somewhat cold in these businesses, Master John Lawder, Master Andrew Oliphant, and Friar Maltman, were sent from Edinburgh to assist in the trial.” “ The friar reasoned long and learnedly against his accusers, and, being answered only with railings and bitter speeches, said, ‘ This is your hour and power of darkness; now you sit as judges, and we stand wrongfully cou-

demned, but the day cometh which will show our innocency, and you shall see your own blindness, to your everlasting confusion; go on, and fulfil the measure of your iniquity.' At which words the Archbishop was greatly moved, affirming that these rigorous executions did hurt the cause of the Church more than could well be thought of, and therefore he declared that, in his opinion, it should be best to save the lives of the men, and take some other course with them: but these others, who were sent to assist, told him expressly, that, if he followed any milder course than that which had been kept at Edinburgh, they could not esteem him the Church's friend; whereupon he was compelled to give way to their cruelty, and thus these innocents were condemned to be burnt alive." "When they were brought to the place of their suffering, they used not many words, but, commending their souls to God, after they were tied to the stake, endured the fire constantly, without expressing any token of fear or amazement."

I could give a much more detailed account of the preaching and sufferings of Hamilton and others, from other historians; but I prefer giving that of Archbishop Spotswood, Lord Primate of all Scotland, because his word will go farther with Papists than that of a meaner man, especially as he was, as his title page bears, "Privy Counsellor to King Charles the First, that most religious and blessed Prince."

After saying so much of the severity of Popish persecutions, it may be interesting to know something of the manner in which Protestants persecute Papists. One instance, at present, shall suffice. It is reported of a late Popish priest, in a neighbouring town, that he complained much of being persecuted. The good people, his neighbours, could not think what he meant, for he seemed to be living in as much peace and comfort as any of themselves. On inquiry, it turned out that, when he had gone into a cotton mill, to inquire about some of his people, the children whispered to one another, that is the Popish priest. This was his persecution!

If it be objected, that this is only an instance which has occurred in modern times, while my instances of Popish persecution are of an old date, I answer, that the older a doctrine or practice is, Papists like it the better; that Popery is always the same; that the practice of their Church in former days is her practice still, wherever she has the power and the opportunity of doing what she formerly did; whereas Protestants acknowledge their former imperfections, are thankful for any improvement they have made, and they hope to improve still farther.

THE

Protestant,

No. XV

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24th, 1818.

I HOPE the facts given in my two last Numbers will be considered by my readers as sufficient to fix the charge of intolerance upon Papists themselves. Popery is avowedly an exclusive system. I have shown that it was so in ages past; and I have now to show that it is so still. In doing this, I shall not rest my proof on the recent persecutions in France, but on a document published in the Orthodox Journal of last month.

It is the misfortune of the King of the Netherlands, that, in the greater part of his kingdom, the Romish religion prevails, while he is a Protestant, and is desirous that all his subjects should enjoy equal liberty. The constitution of the kingdom, indeed, provides for unlimited freedom in religious worship, by all denominations who shall live peaceably; nay, more, "all the subjects of the King, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever." On this very account, the new constitution is condemned by the Popish bishops; and they refuse taking the oath prescribed by law. They declare, in effect, that Jesus Christ has given to each of them a certain portion of the surface of the globe, which is called a diocese. "The power," they say, "which bishops have to watch over the teaching of Christian faith and morality, through the whole extent of their dioceses, like that of fulfilling all the other functions of the ministry, emanates from the will and authority of Jesus Christ." Hence, they will not allow the sovereign so much as the power of regulat-

ing public instruction in the schools; and they will not suffer that any faith but that of Rome shall be taught or professed in those parts of the globe which Christ has given them. I should give the document entire were it not too long. It is entitled, "*DOCTRINAL DECISION of the bishops of the kingdom of the Netherlands, on the oath prescribed by the new constitution.*" After stating the duties of bishops as guardians and deposits of the faith and morality of the gospel, they say, "It is to them, therefore, that are particularly addressed these words of the Holy Ghost:—*Even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee.*" These, by the by, are no more the words of the Holy Ghost, than those of the Orthodox Journal are, but merely those of an apocryphal writer, (*Ecclesiasticus* iv. 28. which the bishops quote, *Eccl.* iv. 33.; which, with an ignorant reader, may pass for the acknowledged canonical book, *Ecclesiastes*. These bishops declare that they cannot take the prescribed oaths, because, say they, "In fact, they bind themselves by the said oaths to observe and maintain all the articles of the new constitution, and, consequently, those which are opposed to the spirit and maxims of the Catholic religion, or which evidently tend to oppress and enslave the Church of Jesus Christ. Now, such are the following articles:—Article 190. Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all. Article 191. Equal protection is granted to all the religious communions which exist in the kingdom. Article 192. All the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever. Article 193. The public exercise of any form of worship cannot be prevented, except it be liable to trouble the public order and tranquillity. Article 196. The king takes care that all worships keep themselves within the obedience due to the laws of the state."

Such are the laws in the new kingdom of the Netherlands, with regard to religious freedom, and it is difficult to conceive any thing more liberal, where there are laws about religion, and, indeed, the House of Orange have been for ages distinguished as the friends of religious liberty. But the Romish bishops will not consent to such articles: they abhor such liberal ideas. As to Article 190 and 191, they say:—"1st. To swear to maintain the liberty of religious opinions, and the equal protection granted to all forms of worship, what else is it but to swear to maintain to protect error as well as truth; to favour the progress of anticatholic doctrines; to sow, as much as in us lies, the tares and poison which are to infect the present and future generations: to contribute thus, and it cannot be done more effectually, to extinguish gradually, in these fine countries, the torch of the true faith?"

The Catholic Church which has ever rejected error and heresy from her bosom, could not regard as her true children, those who would dare to swear to maintain that which she has never ceased to condemn."

"Article 192.—2. To swear to maintain the observance of a law, which renders all the subjects of the king, of whatsoever religious belief they may be, capable of maintaining all dignities and employments whatsoever, would be to justify beforehand and to sanction the measures which may be taken to confide the interests of our holy religion, in these provinces so eminently Catholic, to Protestant functionaries."

I have not been an opposer to what is called Catholic emancipation, on the liberal ground of emancipating all dissenters alike, and putting them all, if good subjects, upon an equal footing with regard to civil privileges; but, supposing I were an opposer, I could not use a stronger argument than that furnished by these Belgian bishops. If all the subjects of the king are eligible to public offices, then they contemplate great danger to their holy religion, from the appointment of Protestant functionaries in their provinces so eminently Catholic. I am sure, the argument applies with double force to our country, so eminently Protestant;—if all shall be equally eligible to public offices—if we shall thereby come under the government of Popish functionaries, there will be more danger to Protestantism in Britain, than to Popery in Belgium, in proportion as Papists are more zealous than Protestants, in propagating their peculiar tenets.

The declaration of these Belgian bishops is given in the Orthodox Journal, without animadversion, and, I believe, with approbation, as it seems to accord with the general spirit of the Editor and his Correspondents. With what face then can they cry out against our government for refusing them here, what they will not grant to Protestants in the Netherlands? They are continually railing against the British government for refusing them their just rights,—their undoubted rights,—their unalienable rights, of which, they say, they have been unjustly deprived by the intolerance of the British government. Will they grant that the rights of Protestants in the Netherlands, and in Spain, are as just, and undoubted, and unalienable, as theirs are in Britain and Ireland? I am sure they will not; and if they possessed a particle of modesty or discretion, they would forbear making such an outcry about their deprivations, and their rights, till they had prevailed with their ghostly father at Rome, to command their dear sons, the kings of Spain and Portugal, and the Belgian bishops, to grant as much liberty to Protestants in their dominions and dioceses, as Papists already have in Britain and Ireland. They cannot rea-

sonably complain, if they receive as much as they would give; and they have received a great deal more.

But, let any one ask Papists to say plainly what they mean by their just rights? and, if they are candid, they will answer, the entire possession of the kingdom, and all things in it. This, they say, they formerly possessed, and they complain of having been unjustly deprived of it, by the violence of Knox and others, at the Reformation. Let things be restored to the condition in which they stood before that period, and they will have obtained their just rights; then, if any Protestants shall remain in the country, they may have the choice which Henry VIII. gave to his heretical subjects, "turn or burn."

To come nearer our own door, Popery is proved to be intolerant by a furious philippic against THE PROTESTANT, in the Chapel in Clyde Street, on Sabbath, the 4th of this present month. The unhappy individual, who writes these pages, was as good as excommunicated, after the solemn pantomime of high mass, in the presence of a vast congregation of Protestants and Papists. I do not say that his excommunication was accompanied by the usual solemnities; it was not done from the altar, but only from the pulpit, and the lights were not extinguished; but he was declared to be no Christian, which was putting him without the pale of the Church; and his person and publications were consigned to everlasting infamy. As the person principally concerned was not present, he cannot give a particular account of the matter; but, from some reports which have reached his ear, he believes he was loaded with nearly as many curses, as the Pope pronounced upon the poor alum-maker, for which see my fifth Number. This violence of the priest was merely the raging of the tyger in his cage; but it showed what he would do, if he were under no restraint. By one summary and *flaming* argument, he would refute, and for ever silence, the enemy of the true faith.

Having occupied about three numbers and a half, in replying to one sentence of AMICUS VERITATIS, about bigotry and intolerance, I must now endeavour to get over the ground a little faster. Part First, page 28, this Gentleman says, "Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience." AMICUS VERITATIS did right to inform us that it was Demosthenes, the orator, who said this, lest we should have ascribed it to some other Demosthenes; and certainly there is not much in the sentence that would make any admirer of the orator contend for it. If it is meant to be a reflection on the natural disposition of mankind, that "they who speak their own praises are heard with

impatience," I would very cheerfully vindicate this trait in the character of my fellow creatures. A much greater than Demosthenes said, "Let another praise thee, and not thine own lips."

In fact, the Papists are incessantly praising themselves and their church; and I am not surprised that they should find people who hear this very impatiently. AMICUS VERITATIS speaks of his brethren as "a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue." (Part I: page 30.) And, in the short advertisement published at the end of Part I. from the Glasgow Chronicle, he calls them "the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world." Now, it is very probable that if he talks this way of his brethren and of himself, in company, he will be heard with impatience, as he deserves to be. I have no quarrel with my private Popish neighbours, who are living peaceably, and following their lawful occupations: I have no wish to diminish their respectability; and if they are the most respectable body of Christians in the world, it is the better for themselves. My controversy is with their priest, and with others who deceive them, and who flatter them with their goodness, and their virtues, and respectability, instead of directing them, as poor sinners, as all men are, to Christ, the only refuge of the guilty.

A leading subject in the sermons of Popish priests is, I am informed, the praise of their own church. She is an apostolical church,—she is a catholic church,—a perpetually visible church,—an infallible church,—but, above all, she is a *holy* church. Now, I do not wonder that this should be heard with impatience. My astonishment is, that so many citizens of Glasgow, otherwise men of sense, should be able to sit with patience, and hear such nonsense. The Church of Rome is neither apostolical, nor catholic, nor infallible: that she has been perpetually visible for many hundred years, aye, and tangible too, has been experienced by thousands of men, women, and children, who have felt the weight of her arm; but it is not so clear that she is a *holy* church. In the common acceptation of the word, holy is to be free from sin—to be separated from the world, in its principles and practices—to be like Jesus Christ, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners. Those who believe in Christ, are made, in this respect, somewhat like him; very imperfectly, indeed, while in this world; but they possess a resemblance. They will not live in sin: they will not knowingly commit sin; or, if they do, they will have no rest till they obtain pardon and peace through the blood of atonement. Contrast this with the character of the Church of Rome, as given by a divine of her own, which I repeat from Part I. page 25. "Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for

money; so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a man can commit, is to be poor. Shameful to relate; they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots, who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And in some places they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book, which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, *The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery*, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes, there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." Such is the testimony of Claude D'Espence, a Parisian divine, of great note in the Romish church.

If the Church of Rome be a holy church, it will, of course, be holiest at the head. Be it known, then, that Pope Paul III. in the third year of his Papacy, granted a bull for publicly licensing brothels: and gave an indulgence for the commission of lewdness, provided the man paid a certain fine to the holy see, and the woman a yearly sum for her license, and entered her name in the public register. In the days of this Pope, there are said to have been forty-five thousand such women in Rome; and, besides the amount of the annual license which each took out for the privilege of prostitution, the Church received a part of their weekly income. Each brothel had an iron chest fixed into the wall, into which every man put his offering; and three agents of the holy see went round weekly to open the chests, and divide what was found in them;—one third part went to the house, one third to the women, and one third to the holy church, for the purpose, it was pretended, of redeeming captives of the Romish religion from the Turks. If any man chose to be wicked, in a more private manner, and went to a person, or a house, unlicensed, he was, on discovery, to be excommunicated, or to pay seven times the price which his sin would have cost in a lawful way.

Such was the holy church at its very head, and it would be easy to trace the same character through all its members. I do not mean individual members, for there were some individuals who knew, acknowledged, and deplored, the wickedness of their church; such as the Parisian divine whom I have quoted; but I mean the different parts of the church, as it appeared in different countries, in its brotherhoods, and sisterhoods, and monastic establishments, resembling so many brothels. On this subject much might be said, but I shall not pollute my pages by being more particular. Their very catechisms and books of devotion are full of the poison of impurity. The questions asked at con-

fession, according to a small manual in my possession, are disgusting in the extreme, and must inevitably pollute the minds of young persons who submit to be catechised privately by a priest.

In short, it is one of the worst characters of that church, that real holiness is no way necessary to the enjoyment of all its privileges and honours. If one will but implicitly submit to all its impositions, he may live as wickedly as he pleases, and be assured of heaven at last. Of this we have a striking instance in our own King Charles II. Papists strongly maintain that he died in the faith of Rome; and I have by me two documents which are understood to prove the fact. They are certified by his brother, King James II. to have been found, in Charles' own hand-writing, after his death. Now we all know what sort of life Charles lived till the very last; we never had any evidence of his repentance; yet the church of Rome eagerly claims him as one of her children, which led the historians of the English dissenters to say, "That must indeed be a *holy* mother church which contends for the honour of having such a son as Charles the Second."

Among Papists it is as common to call their church holy, as to call the Pope his Holiness, or the King his Majesty; and they are continually praising their holy church. I find in general that the more of man and the less of God there is in any church, the more it is praised by its members; and the reason is, people are always ready to praise what is their own. Whenever we hear the terms, holy church, or apostolical church, or incomparable church, we may be sure there is something wrong. The real church of Christ, like the virtuous woman, does not make a talk of her holiness or virtue, but lets her works praise her in the gates.

The Orthodox Journal follows up the praise of its own church with the praise of its members. The Editor speaks as if it were universally admitted that his brethren are more decent and moral than their Protestant neighbours. He tells us that it was the laxity of morals, encouraged by the Reformers in the time of Henry VIII. that made so many forsake the Church of Rome; and he predicts that, if the veto is conceded, and the Catholic priest taught to depend upon the ministry for promotion, "he will neglect to practise the duties of his office, his flock will become indifferent to religion, and, in the course of a few years, Catholics will not be distinguished from the rest of their countrymen for the infidelity of their opinions, and the looseness of their morals." From this we are led to believe, if we can believe it, that the state of morals is much better among Papists than among ourselves, and that Papists are in danger of becoming depraved in their morals by contact with us.

The Orthodox Journalist tells us further, still speaking the praise

of himself and his brethren, "The only chain which binds the ardent attachment of the Irish laity to the clergy, is the spotless purity of their character, and the knowledge which they have, that they derive their functions from the Holy Ghost." This is speaking their own praise with a witness. The *spotless purity* of the character of the Irish priests! We had very lately an opportunity of judging of this, in the person of one of them, who, in the Chapel in Clyde Street, for nearly an hour together, poured forth a rhapsody of scurrilous abuse, and downright lies, about John Knox and the Reformation;—barefaced impudent lies,—known to be such by every person then present, who professed a moderate knowledge of history. But I believe, lies are not considered spots in the character of a Popish priest, if they be *lies* for the advancement of the *true* faith. The Jesuit Missionaries in China, finding the people despise Christianity, because its founder was crucified, denied the fact of the crucifixion, and told the Chinese that it was a falsehood invented by the Jews to discredit the gospel. I have no doubt the Jesuits in Clyde Street would do the same, if they thought it would increase their popularity, or bring more money into their chest. And, indeed, to deny the fact of the crucifixion of Christ, is not worse than to deny the sufficiency of his atonement, which is done by them every day, when they direct sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves, or to rely on the merit of saints.

If we would judge truly of the moral character of a sect, we must see them not where they are few and despised, but where their system is predominant. Attend, therefore, to the testimony of all travellers who have lately visited France, where Popery is the established religion, and it will be found that there the state of morals is most deplorable. I need not go into details, for the fact is well known to every one who has conversed with such travellers, or perused their writings. I am not, by any means, disposed to praise the national morality of Protestants, though I am sure it would not shrink from a comparison with that of Papists; but I know that the tendency of Protestant doctrines is to produce true morality, and that such is their invariable effect, wherever they are cordially embraced; whereas, he who embraces the doctrines of Rome, has positive encouragement to live in all manner of vice, knowing that, for a little money, he can procure pardon at any time: and that, should he even die unpardoned, a small legacy to the church will procure his release from purgatory, and his admission into heaven. Besides, the priests have actually a motive to encourage the commission of sin, for they would have no trade without it—no income but from the pardons which they grant; as some excisemen are said to wink at smuggling, for the sake of the seizures and the fines.

THE

Protestant,

No. XVI.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31st, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS writes as if he laboured under great disadvantage in this controversy. The "PROTESTANT," he says, "has greatly the advantage, and more particularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally ensure him of being received with approbation." This Gentleman chose a signature which signifies a "Friend of Truth." How justly he is entitled to this name, my readers are now able to judge. Let them think of his falsehood with regard to Luther, and many other falsehoods in his writings, and say whether I may not with justice prefix a syllable to his name, and call him INIMICUS VERITATIS?

It is really not worth while to descend to personalities of this kind; but since I have undertaken to answer all that my Popish adversaries have written, I must not overlook even this trifle. He means it to be understood, I suppose, that my signature will go farther than his; and that a Protestant has a better chance of being favourably received, write what he may, than a Friend of Truth, who writes nothing but the truth. This is about as good as his other assertions and insinuations. Papists are continually boasting of the truth, as if the truth lived with them, and would die with them; whereas their whole system is built upon falsehood, and is supported by lies; which I have, I think, proved already, and may prove again before I have done.

When he asserted that my signature, "A PROTESTANT," would very generally ensure my being received with approbation, he said more than he knew to be true, and I believe more than was warranted by truth, at the time. I have the satisfaction to know, that now, and for some weeks past, my Papers have

been received with approbation, in different parts of the country, and their circulation is much beyond any thing that I contemplated: in so much, that some of the Numbers have been printed a second and a third time. For this I express my gratitude to a numerous class of readers; and I am encouraged by it to persevere in labours which would sometimes be irksome, if they were not relieved by a persuasion that they may be useful to my fellow Protestants, and that, at least, they can do no harm to my fellow creatures of the Romish communion, many of whom, I am informed, read what I write; and I shall not have written in vain, if any one of them shall be led to read the Bible, and judge for himself, whether or not the things which I have written are true.

But I cannot allow myself to forget that, at the time when AMICUS VERITATIS wrote the sentence which I have quoted, and for some time afterwards, there were many Protestants from whom I received no encouragement. There were some from whom I received hints, directly and indirectly, that they thought I had engaged in a very unnecessary and invidious undertaking, and who blamed me for writing against the "Roman Catholics," as if that were now a thing quite inconsistent with liberality and Christian charity. I know that this proceeded from ignorance, and I was neither surprised nor offended by it. Most people had forgotten, and the younger part of our population did not know, what Popery was. It appeared among us a very harmless thing. Great pains were taken to make us believe that it never was, at any time, or in any country, worse than we have seen it in Glasgow for twenty years past; and I believe the general impression upon the community, especially upon the young and the sentimental of both sexes, has been in favour of that system, ever since so many of their priests sought and found an asylum in this country from the miseries that threatened them, at the time of the French Revolution. At that time the sympathies of the people in general were awakened on their behalf. The support of the Popish exiles became identified with the preservation of social order; our ministers ceased to pray for the downfall of the Man of Sin; they ceased to instruct their people with regard to the nature of Popery, or to warn them of their danger from it. I believe most of them did so, in the simplicity of their hearts, not contemplating the possibility of danger from a system which seemed to be overthrown while Bonaparte was sovereign of continental Europe. From these circumstances, great ignorance with regard to Popery prevailed all over Britain; and the labours of the PROTESTANT were at first received very coolly, except by Christians of the old school, who could not forget what their fathers had suffered from the cruelty of the Antichristian Beast.

It does not become me to say that my writings have produced any important change in this respect ; but it is certain that they are now received with more favour, and read with more avidity, than they were at first. Many have confessed to me that they did not know what Popery was till they read my Papers ; and from the noise which has been made about them at different times in their own Chapel, I am led to believe that Papists themselves feel the truth of what I have written.

I had said, in my first Letter in the Glasgow Chronicle, if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS replies, (see Part I. p. 29.) " I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic Chapel was asked for a charitable purpose ? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion ? Consequently the Chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement."

My remark did not regard the charitable object of the Oratorio, but the feeling of those present with regard to the *subjects* of it. (For the subjects, see Part I. pp. 1, 2.) They embrace some of the most important doctrines of the word of God. I do not think it lawful, in any case whatever, to make these the subjects of amusement. AMICUS VERITATIS disclaims the idea of their being so. Then the Oratorio is admitted to have been an act of solemn worship. I know, however, that it was not at the time held out as such ; if it had, there would not, perhaps, have been so many Protestants present, especially as the whole service was conducted in Latin, in which no person could possibly worship, but those who understood the language. Of those Protestants who attended the Popish Chapel on that day, I am persuaded not one went for the purpose of divine worship ; but the Papists understand them to have done so.

AMICUS VERITATIS asks, if I do not know that charity is the essence of religion ? I do know it, if it be the charity of the Bible ; that is, love of God and of our fellow creatures. This is undoubtedly the essence of religion. The end of the commandment is charity, or love ; but I do not know that giving and receiving money is the essence of religion, though I believe it is the best part of Popery. I think I am giving weekly evidence of my charity towards Papists, in my labours on their behalf. I do not know how I can show this better than by endeavouring to open their eyes to their own true interests, both for time and eternity. Their priests are deceiving them by means of lies and imposition ; whether they profess to regenerate them by baptism, or establish them in Christianity by confirmation, or pardon their

sins by the sacrament of penance, or clear their way to heaven by extreme unction, or deliver the souls of their friends from Purgatory, on being paid for it,—all is downright imposition. And I have such charity for all the Papists in the world, that I wish every one of them was convinced of the truth; I wish that they would forsake their priests; or, what would be still better, they would all come to Christ, and bring their priests with them, not by force, but by means of persuasion—by convincing them of the truth.

Christ is exhibited in the Bible for the salvation of sinners; and he makes all sinners, without exception, welcome to come to him directly and immediately, promising, “him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.” What is the use of going to a priest for the pardon of sin? Priests are sinful fellow creatures; they need pardon as much as those whom they profess to pardon. Christ alone had power on earth to forgive sin; and he is exalted to heaven for the very purpose—a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins. I request my readers, especially those of the Romish communion, not to take this on my word, but to read the Bible for themselves, and see if it be not so, that Christ bids them come to himself at once; and that a priest can no more save them, than they can save themselves. Charity requires me thus to tell them what I know to be true; and seeing so many of them do me the favour to read my writings, I hope none of them will be the worse, but that they will be the better, in consequence of what they read.

“Charity is the essence of religion.” Then, why is it that my Popish opponents have no charity for me? They profess to believe that I am in error; and, I suppose, they think my error is a deadly one. Why, then, do they not use means to convince and reclaim me? I have invited Mr. SCOTT to write against me, and to show where I am in error; I have even offered to print what he shall write without expense to him; but I cannot get a word from him. My other opponents are equally silent. It is evident, therefore, that they have no charity for the PROTESTANT—no wish to reclaim him from his errors. They brought a Dublin priest, indeed, to their pulpit to curse him, as Balak, king of Moab, brought Balaam to curse the children of Israel; and the modern false prophet was not like the ancient one, for he did curse most bitterly, without one word of blessing, or even of compassion for the object of his malediction. This, it seems, is their charity. This is the essence of their religion. They know no way of convincing a heretic but that of burning him, if they have the power, or of cursing him, if they have not.

Charity, I have said, in the Bible sense of the word, is love—the love which springs from the belief of the gospel; and it leads

him who possesses it, not to curse, but to bless his fellow creatures. But it is evident, that AMICUS VERITATIS considers the word only as relating to the giving and receiving of money; and, lest my readers of the Romish communion should suppose that my charity for them is of the same nature, and that I am at all this pains to enlighten them by my writings, for the sake of the profits which I derive from them, I hereby assure them that I have not pocketed a single farthing by all that I have written; and that I am determined not to receive any emolument whatever from this work. The price was fixed so low as not to afford a prospect of any profit; but the circulation of my Numbers has of late become so great, that my Printers give me reason to hope there will be something over, after defraying all expenses. This, whatever it may be, shall be cheerfully applied to promote the education of poor persons belonging to the Church of Rome, if it shall be accepted for that purpose. I invite, therefore, persons belonging to that communion to buy and read THE PROTESTANT; and in doing so, they will contribute to the welfare of themselves and their children.

AMICUS VERITATIS lays down a somewhat curious principle, in the passage which furnishes the text of the present Number. "The Catholic Chapel was asked for a charitable purpose; charity is the essence of religion;—consequently the Chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement." I believe there are few charities better entitled to the support of the benevolent than our Royal Infirmary. I believe also that stage-players, and mountebanks, and Indian jugglers, and incombustible ladies, have most, or all of them, performed for the benefit of this and other charities. Does it follow that their performances assumed a religious character when the profits were thus appropriated? Were the Theatre, and the Circus, and the Trades' Hall, not places of amusement, but of religious worship, on these occasions? Certainly, if the goodness or charitable nature of the object sanctified the means of promoting it; which seems to be the meaning of AMICUS VERITATIS, and which is, I believe, an acknowledged tenet of Popery.

AMICUS VERITATIS repeats his assertion, "that it never was a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant indulgence to commit sin." I have, I think, refuted this assertion already, and I may take up the subject again, when I come to vindicate my evidences against his exceptions to their validity. In the meantime, I see plainly that he conceals a quibble under the words *doctrine* and *sin*. When any thing of this kind bears particularly hard upon Papists, they deny it to be a doctrine of their church. To be a *doctrine*, it is not enough that it has

been practised without opposition for hundreds of years by Popes and Bishops, and even sanctioned by general councils. Much less than this, indeed, will make any thing a doctrine, if it be not controverted—if it be not a thing which Papists find it convenient to deny: but if it be any thing that happens to be odious or unpopular at the time, or in the country where it is spoken of, though it has been sanctioned by ever so many councils, and practised by the Pope for ever so long; Papists will deny it to be a doctrine of their church.

They sometimes maintain that a doctrine of the church is that which has had the unanimous consent of the whole church, in all ages; and, upon this principle, they can deny whatever they please; for I believe there is no doctrine or practice known to exist, which has not, at one time or other, been impugned by some of their doctors and saints. We have doctors against doctors, councils against councils, and Popes against Popes; so that, upon this principle, there is nothing that can be brought home to the Church of Rome, but what the individual we are dealing with may be pleased to admit at the time, though it may be denied by all his brethren, and even by himself the next day. Yet this is the infallible church, which was never wrong or mistaken in any point whatever!

But I did not say that it was a *doctrine* of the Church of Rome, that the Pope or a Bishop would grant an indulgence or permission to commit sin. I spoke of their practice;—their avowed and long continued practice, of which the history of Europe, for the last six hundred years, furnishes abundant evidence. I know that Papists also conceal a quibble under the word *sin*. I have shown, in a former Number, from Bellarmine, that the Pope claimed the power of making that which is sin to be no sin; so that that was not *sin* which he granted permission to do. In short, there is no reasoning with Papists with regard to any principle, or even fact, which it is possible they can evade by quibbling or lying. Their system is supported by all deceptableness of unrighteousness.

AMICUS VERITATIS affects great tenderness, and moderation, and fear of giving offence. “If,” says he, (Part I. p. 29.) “in replying to your Correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute: and that

“The blood will follow where the knife is driven,
The flesh will quiver where the pincers tear.”

In order to get, as soon as possible, out of the way of the knife

and the pincers, those instruments of torture with which my opponent seems so familiar, I shall answer the last part of the quotation first. And all that I have to say is, that I know nothing of such weapons, in conducting an argument. I never applied them to any creature, for the purpose of conviction, or for any other purpose; though it is probable he may have done so, and perhaps he is familiar with those effects which he describes in so feeling a manner. The pen is the only weapon in my armoury; and I assure him I would not break his skin with it, though I confess I wish to make him feel ashamed of his misrepresentations and other delinquencies.

I do not know who was the cause of this dispute, but I know it was the person who wrote the paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, which represented the Protestant *worshippers* at the Oratorio, as paying the like respect to the *place*, as to the solemn passages of the word of God, which were sung on that occasion. This certainly was not the PROTESTANT; and if this controversy has disturbed the peace of the Popish part of the community he is not to blame for it.

AMICUS VERITATIS, it seems, did not write with a view to touch the feelings of his Protestant brethren, or from a spirit of recrimination, but from a "necessity of disclosing the truth." What truth has he disclosed? I have again looked over his Letters, and I can see nothing of importance that bears the smallest resemblance to truth, except what he says about the *Cutty Stool*, to which I shall pay all due respect when I come to that subject. But truth is a good thing; and by professing to maintain it, though he should do so by falsehood, he tries to deceive those who confide in him.

From whom did AMICUS VERITATIS learn to use the expression, "my Protestant brethren?" Certainly not from Rome, or from the ancient practice of his holy and infallible church. Does he not know that the Pope called all those who separated from the Church of Rome, "*venomous adders*," who were without mercy to be trodden under foot? (See his Bull for the destruction of the Waldenses, in my second Number.) Did not the holy father declare all who presumed to preach Christ without his consent, or that of his bishops, to be under a perpetual anathema or curse? Did not the king of Arragon, at the instigation of the Pope, declare all separatists to be "vipers and perfidious children?" Did he not declare that he would not suffer such wretches to live? and that against such enemies of God and man he would not contain his indignation, or refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance? (See No. XIII.) Did not the Pope declare Wickliffe, and those who learned the

doctrines of the gospel from him, to be men "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also for vomiting out of the filthy dungeon of their breasts, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies?" This is plain language, and I believe it is so far honest that the Pope meant what he said; but AMICUS VERITATIS, a Papist, holding the Pope as his holy father, whence comes he to speak of these "adders and vipers," and detestable heretics, as his *Protestant brethren*? It is not because he believes the Pope to have been wrong; it is not because Popery has become more moderate, for it is incapable of change; it is not because the Protestant religion is viewed by Papists more favourably than before;—but it is because Papists, in the situation of this writer, study to make themselves popular by using "good words and fair speeches." This, in my opinion, is more offensive than the hardest words of the Pope.

The reader will see that I have got over a good deal of ground in the present Number. I am afraid that I shall be accused, and perhaps convicted, of egotism; a thing which nobody likes worse than I do: but, in case I should add to the crime by apologies, I merely request the reader to remember that it is usual with periodical writers to speak of themselves, and that I have not offended in this respect so much as most of my predecessors.

THE

Protestant,

No. XVII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7th, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us (See Part I. p. 29.) that the Douay Catechism "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church; and is put into the hands of every child that is learning its Christian doctrine." Alas, for the children who have no better means of instruction than that furnished by this Catechism!

This assertion, that it "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church," like most of his other assertions, will not bear examination. When was this approbation expressed? When was it possible that it could be expressed? There has been no meeting of the Catholic Church by its delegates, or otherwise, since the Council of Trent; and I have before me, a Catechism founded upon the decrees of that Council, which differs very materially from the Douay one, as we shall see presently. The Douay Catechism itself does not profess to have the honour of general or universal approbation in the Catholic Church. It has, in short, no voucher whatever. It presents itself with as little ceremony, or introduction, as it were merely a collection of those "excellent new songs," which have been hawked about the country for a hundred years.

I have consulted a number of their Catechisms, several of which are much larger than the Douay one, and are, besides, formally authenticated by the Pope, or some other dignitary of the Church. For instance, "Catechismus ad Parochos ex decreto Concilii Tridentini editus," is published by authority of Pope

PIUS V. "Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme," is printed by order of CHARLES JOACHIM COLBERT, bishop of Montpellier; and the "Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire," is sanctioned by the present Pope, and the Archbishop of Paris. I find none of those originally published in English, or that are in present use in this country, so well authenticated.

In one of my late Numbers, I said there were different versions of the Douay Catechism, or rather, perhaps, different Catechisms, intended for different parts of the world, according to the degree of knowledge or ignorance, which is supposed to exist among the people. I have examined a version that is in common use in Ireland, and another which is used among the Papists in the Highlands of Scotland; and, from this examination, I am confirmed in the idea above expressed. The Douay Catechism, recommended by AMICUS VERITATIS, with all its errors and imperfections, is the least gross, and the least exceptionable. The Papists, therefore, have shown their wisdom in adopting this version to be used in Glasgow, as any thing extremely gross would more readily be detected here than in either the Highlands or Ireland.

The Douay Catechism, for instance, gives the second commandment at full length, which is not done by any other of those which I have mentioned. This seems to have been omitted in most of their Catechisms, for the purpose, no doubt, of concealing the divine prohibition of making and worshipping images. But, as Papists do not publicly worship images in Glasgow, they have not this motive for concealing the commandment; and AMICUS VERITATIS would have us believe it is the same all over the world, and, therefore, he tells us, that this Catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church.

The version used in Ireland has not a word of the second commandment. That in the Highlands has the first and second, as follows:—"The first commandment is, I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have no strange gods before me, &c*." "The second commandment is, thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Thus we see the whole of the second is omitted; but, should any of our acute countrymen in the North, by intercourse with his Southern neighbours, come to learn that he has been robbed of one of the commandments, his

* Wherever what we call the second commandment, or any part of it, is given in their Catechisms, it is attached to the first; then our third is their second, and so on to their ninth, which is divided to make up the ten.

priest can save his credit, by telling him that it lies all under the comprehensive *et cetera*.

This mode of announcing a divine law has, however, the sanction of high authority,—not less than that of the Council of Trent, at least of the “*Catechismus ad Parochos*,” founded on their decrees, in which we read as follows:—“*Primum præceptum decalogi. Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui eduxi te de terra Ægypti, de domo servitutis. Non habebis Deos alienos coram me, non facies tibi sculptile, &c.*” (page 310.) This gives four words of the second commandment, forbidding the making of images; but, as if afraid to venture any farther, lest they should divulge too much of the will of God, which is decidedly against the worship of images, they slur over all the rest with an *&c.*

The Montpellier Catechism, an elaborate work in three volumes, ventures a little farther. To the first commandment they add the following words of the second,—“*Vous ne vous ferez point d'idole, ni d'image taillée en aucune figure pour les adorer, ni pour les servir.*” (Tom. ii. p. 153.) Here, there is no *&c.* and what is given must stand for the whole commandment.

A large work in English, entitled “*The Real Principles of Catholics; or, a Catechism for the Adult*,” (page 121.) gives a few words more of the same commandment, but not nearly the whole: and the Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, does not give a word of it. It gives what is meant for both the first and second, in five words:—“*Thou shalt worship one God;*” (page 75.) and then, after a few questions and answers, it proceeds to a direct contradiction of the divine law, as follows:—“*Q. Does this commandment forbid honouring the saints as the Church does? A. No: because the Church does not render to the saints the same honour as to God; but only honours the saints as the friends of God. Q. Is it forbidden to honour the images of Jesus Christ or of the saints? A. No: because they are honoured only in remembrance of Jesus Christ or of the saints, and the honour paid to the images relates to the objects which they represent. Q. What say you of the honour shown to the relicks of the saints? A. They are likewise honoured in remembrance of the saints.*” The Douay Catechism gives the same doctrine in a more guarded manner:—“*Q. Is it lawful to honour the images of Christ and his saints? A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images or crosses, which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we honour and adore Christ himself. Q. Do Catholics pray to images? A. No, by no means: we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distraction, but not to them; for we know they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit have we then by them? A. They moving-*

ly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints." (pp. 45, 46.) There is here evidently a strong hankering after the worship of images, or which is substantially the same, the worship of God by images; and, if our Glasgow Papists had their will, they would have the image of a saint, or of the cross, at the corner of every street.

This sufficiently accounts for the omission of the second commandment in most of their Catechisms, and it required no small assurance in the Douayists to give it entire; which says expressly, not only thou shalt not worship, but *thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image*. It forbids the worshipping of God by means of any resemblance of any thing in heaven or in earth. But the Church of Rome teaches the very reverse. They permit the worship of images just as the heathen did, who did not profess to worship the image itself, but the god whom it represented. My present subject, however, is not the idolatry of the Church of Rome, but their jugglery, in suppressing the divine command which convicts them of idol worship. On the subject of their idolatry itself, I cannot too strongly recommend the excellent work of Mr. CUNNINGHAME of Lainshaw.

This Gentleman convicts the Douay Catechism of a mistranslation in the second commandment, which serves to cover the Romish practice of doing honour to images, so that they be not *adored*. Their words are, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them;" whereas, the words are literally rendered, "thou shalt not *bow thyself to them*, and shalt not serve them," which expressly condemns their kneeling and worshipping before images, as much as the worshipping of the images themselves.

As I am upon the subject of Catechisms, I shall occupy the remainder of this Number, by extracts from one which will show the doctrine in which our fathers were instructed. For this I am indebted to a friend who has been at great pains to copy the very orthography of the work. It is certainly a curiosity; and, as some late publications have acquired great popularity, for little other reason, that I can think of, than the mixture of broad Scotch in their composition, I expect that what follows will be a recommendation of my work, especially as it is not the vulgar Scotch of the present day, but the classical Scotch of the sixteenth century. It is entitled "Ane Catechism or Schort Instruction, &c. be Father Peter Canisius, Doctour in Theologie." This Catechism of Canisius was held in the very highest reputation by the Papists of the sixteenth century, and translated into all the modern languages. The following translation was made by a zealous Scotch Papist, for the instruction of his countrymen. It has no date, but the table of moveable feasts begins with the ear 1587;

“ Quhat expresses ye nynt articl, (*i. e.* of the Creed) I helieve the Halie Kirk Catholixe, the communion of sancts?—First, yat it is simple, ane, and soundlie agreing in faith—under hir one head Christ, and under his lieutenā, the heighe bischope. To men out of this blessit communion of sancts (as to yam quha war out of the arke of Noe) deathe certainlie is appointit; and none hope of salvation, quhether they be Iew or Ethnikes, quha never receved the faith of the Kirk, or haeretichis, quha has either forsaken ye faith that thay receavit, or corruptit ye same, or the schismatches quha has forsaken the peace and unities of the Kirk, doubtless may not be participant of the grace of God, and eternal salvation, except they be recōcilit and restorit agane to the Kirk—for ye reul of Sanct Cyprian and Sanct Augustine is maist suir, he sal nocht haiv God to his Father quha will nocht haiv the Kirk to his mother.” *page 12.*

The first commandment runs thus, “ Thou sal haiv no un-kouth gods befor me; thou sal nocht mak to thyself ony graven idol to adore it,”—the remaining part is omitted altogether; and what we call the tenth is as usual divided thus:—Ninth, “ Thou sal nocht covet thy nybour’s wyffe.” Tenth, “ Nor his hous, nor mā, nor his maden, nor his ox, nor his asse, nor zet ony thing yat is his.”

“ The ancient Fathers’ testimonies of the Virgin Marie. Sanct Ireneus, lib. V. com. hor. 8. As Eaive was seducit to flee frome God, so was Marie inducit to obey God, that the wergine Marie mycht be advocat for the werginē Eaive, and as mankind war bound unto deathe by ane wergine, so it mycht be lykwise lowsit by an wergine, the unequall ballance of an wergine’s disobedience being maid equal by a wergine’s obedience.” *page 26.* A great part of the Popish books of devotion, in modern English, run in the same strain. In fact, the Virgin Mary is held forth as the Saviour and the goddess of Papists.

Hear St. Chrysostom in Liturgia: “ How worthy and rycht thing is it to glorifie ye mother off God, quha ever is most blessit, altogether unspotted. Mother of God, mair honourabill nor the cherubims, and mair glorious without comparison thane the seraphims, quha without all kinds of corruptions has borne God, we magnifie the truelie quha is the mother of God, Marie full of grace, the Lord is with the, blessit art thou amonges al wimen, and blessit is the fruiet of thy wombe, because thou hes brocht furthe the Salviour of our saulles.” *page 26.*

“ Sanct Ambros, lib. 2. de Virginibus. Let the virginitie and lyffe of the blessit wergine Marie be as it war in an image let furthe to us fra quhome, as out off a glass, scheinnes brichtlie the patrone of chestitie and forme off all vertues.—Marie was so per-

fyte that the lyffe of hir alon may be ane reul off leiving to all others." *page 26.*

" Sanct Gregorio,—O Mother, blessit of wergines, ô thou light quha dwelles in ye tempill of heaven, maist bright, being free fra the filthe of our mortalitie, and now clothed with the robe of immortalitie, to my word, fra heaven incline thine ear, and my prayers, I beseech the, ô wergine, thow heir." *page 27.*

" Sanct Augustin.—Mary, succour the miserabl, help ye discomfortit, comfort the woful, pray for the pepol, mak intercession for the clargie, and pray for the devoute womankynd, let all feil thy relieff quha celebrats thy name." *ibid.*

" Quhat is the Kirk?—The Kirk is the hail nummer of all mē professing the feath and doctrine of Christ, quhilk the Prince of pastours, Christ, committet baith to the Apostle, St. Peter, and to his successoures, to be fed and governit, quhairfoir hæretiques and schismatiques deserve nocht to be includit in ye name of the Kirk, but falselie throw arrogāce usurps the same; quha, albeit they appear to profes the word and doctrine of God, nevertheless, they refuse to be the scheep of the principal pastour and bishops quham Christ in his stead hes maid reuler of his fauld the Kirk, and be perpetual successione in the Romane Kirk hes alwaies been keepit." *page 48.*

" Quhat is to be thocht of evill priests?—It is God's ordinance quhilk can nocht be abolishit, that nocht onlie good priests, but also evill, suld be honoured in his kirk. For he will be acknowledged, hond., and halden in revërce in his ministers." *page 110.* Very comfortable doctrine this for the priests. Bad as well as good, it seems, are God's ordinance; and the one as well as the other are to be honoured in the Church.

" Is matrimonie permitted unto all men?—Nocht sa, (not so) for we are taught be ye Apostles' tradition, as S. Epiphanius witnesses, yat it is sinne to revolt to marriage, after that virginie be promised and vowed. Thairfoir, this place of ye Apostle,—It is better to marry than to burn, pertaines (as S. Ambrose does plainlie pronounce) to hir yat hes nocht zet receaved the vail. Bot she quha promised herself to God, and hes receaved the holy vail is already married, she is coupled to an immortal husband, and gif she will now marrie after the common law of marriage, she committes adultry, and is maid the handmaid of death. Now, the self same reason, and ye same judgement is to be given of monks, and yam yat is in holy orders, for they have damnation, gif they give ye bridle to the bodilye lusts, they falsifie yair former faith.—No man laying his hand to the ploughe, and looking bak again, is meit for ye kingdom of God." *page 117.*

" Compells the Kirk then certain persons to live single and unmarried?—Treulie, our godly and circumspect mother, the Kirk,

compells nocht thairunto, quhilk burdens na man with continence or single lyfe without marriage, but requires of yam, yat they willingly reevee yar law, (as befor said) that they violat nocht thair religion, neither cōtemne or brak ye promiseis ād godlie band quhilk they haiv with Christ and his Kirk." *page 119.*

"Venial sinn is actual also, bot zet sic a ane as maks nocht ane man God's enemie, and for the quhilk the faithfull easily obtains pardon of God."—What can strike more directly at the root of all holiness than this doctrine? Any sin to which a man may be addicted, will be, in his esteem, a venial one; and here he is taught that such does not make him God's enemy, and that he will easily obtain pardon for it!

"A guid vif (wife) is praise worthie, bot a godlie virgin is far to be preferred. The one is under the law, the uthir is under grace. Marriage is guid, quhairbe is had posteritie, and succession of mankind, bot virginitie is better, quhairbe is gotten the inheritance of the kingdom of heavē, and the succession of heavenlie merits ar found. Be a woman cair cam in, bot be a virgin salvation is comine." *page 202.*

I intend, in a future Number, to give a particular account of one of the best of these godly virgins, of whose life and miracles I have got a genuine history. I say miracles, as well as life; for though she died about a thousand years ago, she still continues to perform miracles, if we may believe the Rev. Dr. Milner, one of the Vicars Apostolic in England. My readers will then be able to judge how far these idle drones of godly virgins are to be preferred to their own thrifty good wives. But I must at present proceed with my Catechism:—

"Quhat is to be thought in few words of the evangelical counsels. That thay ar certaine motives and verray commodious supports and helps to give armour to the vaik agains the pleasures of the varld and the flesh, to further guid men's endeavour in the course of trew godliness to the obtaining of better things; and mairover, profitable as I have schawen to get the reward of eternal lyf and mair plenteous glorie in heaven." *page 204.*

"Of the remedie of original sin.—The onlie Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, quhas merit is applied to all men, zounge and awld, be the sacrament of baptisme dewlie administered according to the form of the Kirk. Quhasaever ze be that ar baptized ye have put on Christ, quhairfor they are *. quha denies that children new borne suld be baptized, howbeit they be the children of baptized parēts." *page 216.* "In the baptized, all that quilk has the proper and trew nature of sin is clean takken away; and not onlie hid or not imputit, for God haites nothing in the regenerat. So thair is na damnation to

* I cannot make out the word, but I doubt not it means something very bad.

thame quha are buried with Christ be baptism in his death." *Page 218.*

"Sinners agains the first commandment. 1st, To doute of any article of the Catholique faith. 2d, Over curiously to reason or searche out things of faith. 3d, To favour hereticks to the hurt of the Catholique kirk. 4th, To put ouselves in danger to crab God, that is nocht to flee the occasion quhilk may cause ùs sinne." "Sinners agains the third commandment, (*i. e.* what we call the fourth.) 1st, To worke on halie days. 3d, Not to fast at times cōmādet. 4th, To eat fleshe or ony forbidden meat on days of fasting or abstinence."

This Catechism furnishes prayers to the Virgin Mary, to the halie angels, to our guid angel, and to all the sancts in heaven. There are several other curious passages which it is not convenient at present to transcribe.

In this, as in all their Catechisms, the true Christian doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, and by faith in him, is kept out of view; and what makes the system worse than downright infidelity is, that it effectually denies the Saviour, while it professes to honour him. For instance, in one of the last quotations, he is called the only Mediator, whose merit is applied to all men, young and old; yet it is applied only in such a way as that the priest shall have the doing of it. It is by the sacrament of baptism duly administered according to the form of the kirk. No man can do this but a priest: so that, without his aid, all that Christ has done, in working out a righteousness for the justification of the ungodly, and all that he does by his word and Spirit, go for nothing. Thus the priest actually gives himself out as the Saviour; for it is by the application of water, and salt, and spittle, by his fingers, that the regeneration of a sinner is effected. I request my readers, of the Romish communion, to reflect on this. They are not behind their neighbours in point of common sense; and, I am sure, if they will think seriously on the subject, and apply to it the principles of common sense, not to say of Scripture, they will soon be convinced of the folly of ascribing such powers to a creature like themselves.

Christ died for the ungodly. The gospel is the divine testimony concerning him. When the Holy Spirit opens the heart of a sinner to receive that testimony, he is born again. This is the work of God. A priest can have no more hand in it than in creating the world. Yet any man who shall make known the truth to his neighbour, may be honoured as the instrument of saving him. This is what I most earnestly desire as the fruit of my labours; but I know it will not—it cannot happen, but through the influence of the Divine Spirit.

THE
Protestant,

No. XVIII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14th, 1818.

IN my last Number, I examined the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS,—“ The Douay Catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church ;” and I showed that there are several other Catechisms of apparently higher authority in the Church, which differ materially from the Douay one, particularly with regard to the omission and mutilation of the second commandment. He quotes the Douay Catechism on the subject of indulgences; and he wishes to have it believed, that his Church holds no other doctrine than this :—An indulgence is “ not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church ; but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance.”

I could show that other Catechisms differ on this point, as well as on the second commandment. The Pope will be allowed, I suppose, to be higher authority than the Douay College; and he declares, “ that the *dead* as well as the living, who truly obtain indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth.” (See his Brief, Part I. p. 26. quoted from DUPIN, IV. 17.) I cannot suppose the Pope to be guilty of such an absurdity as to speak of delivering the *dead* from the *temporal* punishment due to their sins, for the dead have done with temporal things. He countenances, therefore, the doctrine of the French Catechism, that indulgences free from punishment, both in this world and the next. He says, indeed, expressly in:

the same brief, that the benefit of indulgences was granted to those who were alive, as to those who were *in Purgatory*. Perhaps, however, he will call Purgatory a temporal thing, though, from the hundreds of thousands of years, for which some are said to remain in it, and for which indulgences are granted to others, we should imagine it must remain after all temporal things have come to an end.

I shall, however, take the subject of indulgences as the Douay Catechism gives it, and answer *AMICUS VERITATIS*' challenge, which is:—"Now, Sir, I would ask any honest impartial man, possessed of Christian candour, could he infer from this answer, that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin? No, Sir, the idea is absurd; and I am astonished that your Correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself, as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done." (Part I. p. 29.)

It is not likely that this Gentleman will allow the PROTESTANT to be "an honest impartial man." Be that as it may, he will endeavour to make good his position out of this most softened and modified definition of an indulgence. I said, (Part I. p. 7.) that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin; that he claimed, farther, the power of granting to individuals and families, a full remission of all their sins past and future, which would probably operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons knew beforehand, that they had got a full pardon. I think I have already established all this by a number of facts and documents; but I proceed now to show, that encouragement to commit sin rises naturally out of the doctrine of indulgences, as given even by the Douay Catechism. It is "*a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance.*" Indulgences stand immediately connected with penance. By this sacrament, a priest grants full absolution. He declares the sinner to be relieved from the guilt of all his sins, and reconciled to God, but that he ought to make some remuneration for so great a favour,—that he should suffer something in his body as a punishment for his sins thus forgiven; and the design of our indulgence is to release him from such suffering, which is usually done for an adequate consideration.

Now, I shall not ask every impartial honest man, but I ask every intelligent Christian, whether such doctrine does not naturally lead to all the evil of which I have accused the Popish practice of granting indulgences? Every one whose religion is derived from the Bible, knows that human nature is corrupted and depraved; that every man in his natural state is an enemy to

God, and a hater of his holy law ; that he is in love with sin ; and that he is, in one way or another, under the dominion of corrupt passions, which maintain a constant opposition to the law of God. There are, however, many restraints which prevent individuals from running to all the excess to which their passions would lead them. One of these restraints is, the fear of future punishment. The doctrine, therefore, which takes away this restraint, without imparting a new nature to the sinner, is justly chargeable with all the evil that shall result from it. Such is the Popish doctrine of indulgences connected with penance.

A person guilty of the greatest crimes, receives the sacrament of penance on the usual terms. He must, indeed, make a form of confession before a priest ; he must profess contrition ; he must promise amendment : but all this is mere form and mere words. His heart remains as hard as it was ; he is as much in love with sin as ever. When, therefore, the sacrament of penance is over, he is told that he must do some good work, or suffer some punishment for all his great sins which he has confessed ; but, that he may have an indulgence ; that is, he may be released from such suffering, for a certain sum, which he cheerfully pays :— he sets off to plunge anew into the stream of wickedness, like the profligate seductress in the seventh of Proverbs : “ I have peace-offerings with me ; this day have I paid my vows ;—come let us take our fill of pleasures.”

That this is no overwrought picture, is sadly verified by the history of the Church of Rome. and of those nations which have submitted to her yoke. Independently of history and experience, an accurate knowledge of human nature would infer this result from the doctrine in question. Wicked men are often very superstitious. They stand in awe of they know not what. There is a judgment upon them. There is a tribunal in their own breast that condemns them. They know not well what it is ; but they are taught to believe that it is something from which a priest can deliver them. Wherever, therefore, an opportunity of crime presents itself to a man of this character, whether it be to gratify his revenge, or avarice, or lust, he enters into it with all his heart, knowing beforehand that the priest can pardon his guilt ; and, that if he should be ordained to make some satisfaction for his crimes, he can have that also remitted for a small sum by an indulgence. The prospect of a divine tribunal, and of a righteous Judge, is concealed from his view. He seeks no pardon but that which the priest can give ; and he is not taught to believe that any other is necessary. As corrupt human nature is constituted, such a doctrine must always operate as an encouragement to commit sin.

I might corroborate this reasoning by innumerable facts from

history; but the following quotation from Bellarmine, the great champion of the Popish cause, is worth many facts, because it is a plain testimony of the actual state of things in the Church, as known to himself; and he speaks as if the same were known to all:—"We cannot deny," says he, "but that some are bound by the penitential canons to some thousands of years' penance; for, if to every deadly sin there be due by the canons so many years' penance, as to some three, to some seven, &c. then he that hath accustomed himself to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits murders, thefts, sacrileges, adulteries, without doubt the Popes had respect to such as these, when they gave indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years." *Bellar. de Indulg. lib. I. cap. 9. p. 25, as quoted in Morning Exercise, p. 491.*

Thus we see, in point of fact, on the testimony of Bellarmine, that the greatest criminals, who were guilty of perjury and blasphemy every moment of their lives, yet received pardon from the Pope and his clergy, and received indulgences too for thousands of years. Is it necessary to say more to prove that the Popish practice of indulgences is the fruitful parent of all wickedness; and that it operates as an encouragement, and even as a permission, to commit sin?

Suppose it to be so that an indulgence is no more than a releasing of the temporal punishment due for sin already pardoned, its consequences must be extremely pernicious. Sinners are most impressed by sensible and visible things. Temporal punishment is much more an object of dread than eternal punishment. From the natural atheism and unbelief of the human heart, men think very little of what shall happen after death; they do not believe that God will be strict to mark their sins against them, or that he will be so cruel as to punish them very severely for their faults and infirmities; in plain English, they do not believe what the Bible declares concerning sin, and the eternal punishment which it incurs. This appears very plainly in the case of those, for instance, who read in the third commandment, that "the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain," and who will yet rather take their chance of standing as guilty before God, and suffering all the consequences, than deny themselves the trifling gratification of mouthing or even mincing an oath. We cannot wonder, therefore, that those who are under the influence of uncontrollable passion, should seek to gratify that passion, fearless of consequences in the other world, if they can escape that which is very painful in the present. Any thing like the misery of the other world they have never seen; of its nature they have no distinct ideas; of its reality they have no abiding conviction. This has, therefore, little influence in deterring them from the commis-

sion of sin. But the subject of present suffering they do understand. They can comprehend the misery of being immured for years in a dungeon; they can imagine how painful it would be to tear the flesh from their bones, by a whip judiciously applied by their own hands; they could even shrink from the idea of being obliged to subsist on bread and water for six months together: and I doubt not they could have a very lively feeling of the hardship of being obliged to stand before a large congregation, in a white sheet, confessing their sins. Now, by an indulgence, the fear of incurring all, or any of these, is effectually removed. The only thing, therefore, that can operate with any degree of force upon the mind of an abandoned sinner, as a preventive of crime, is taken out of the way; and he is encouraged by the Church to indulge himself in all manner of wickedness.

In short, men may speculate as they please about the moral influence of any religious system; but, while human nature remains as it is, it will be found by experience, that the doctrine which holds out to men the certainty of obtaining pardon, and an indulgence whenever they please to ask and pay for it, must operate, and will operate, as an encouragement to commit sin.

I am aware that an objection like this is urged against the gospel itself, by unbelievers of the Protestant name, and of every other name. We are told that the doctrine which holds out the prospect of pardon and salvation to the chief of sinners, through the merits of Christ, without any merits of their own, opens a door to all manner of licentiousness, and that it operates as an indulgence to commit sin. I claim this objection against the gospel of Christ as an auxiliary to my argument. It declares that the natural feeling, and the experience of mankind, are in my favour. I am speaking of men in their natural state, but who possess a portion of what is called common sense, and who know something of human nature. They speak what they know and what they feel. Ignorant of the divine influence which accompanies the belief of the gospel, and which renews the sinner to holiness, they cannot but come to the conclusion, that the doctrine which holds out salvation to the vilest of the human race, without merit on their part, must operate as an encouragement to sin. Now, the Popish mode of granting pardon and indulgence possesses no such divine influence; nor makes provision for renewing the sinner to holiness; with them there is no regeneration but that which is effected by baptism; the pardoned and indulged sinner remains as great a sinner as ever; and his pardon and indulgence, so easily obtained, must without doubt operate as an encouragement, and have all the effect of a permission to commit sin.

AMICUS VERITATIS alludes to the pardon of sin which the

Almighty promises in Scripture; and takes advantage of this in order to justify the Popish practice of granting indulgences, even though they were to extend to the plenary remission of all the crimes of the sinner, and of all the punishment which they deserve. "Now," says he, (Part I. p. 42.) surely your Correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred Scriptures, promises to give the truly penitent a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means to grant him permission or indulgence to commit sin." Indeed, I would not hesitate to assert, that this would operate as a permission to commit sin, if the Almighty promised and granted pardon as the Papists do. If the Almighty were to promise and grant pardon of sin, without reference to the great atonement, and without making adequate provision for the future holy life of the sinner, it would appear to the whole universe that he thought lightly of the evil of sin; and such is the depravity of human nature, that such procedure would be considered as a connivance at sin, and an encouragement to live in all manner of wickedness. Nay, such is the depravity of human nature, that could we suppose it possible that a man were truly penitent to-day, and that he had received the full pardon of all his sins, if he did not receive at the same time a new heart and a right spirit, he would before to-morrow be plunged as deep in the mire of iniquity as ever.

Now, when a Popish priest pardons sin by the sacrament of penance, according to the Douay Catechism, there is no reference whatever to the great atonement, or satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ. In answer to the question, "What is satisfaction?" we have for answer, "A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest to whom we confess." And, as for any radical change of heart and character, any provision for the future holy life of the pardoned sinner, Popery knows nothing of the matter: it would be held heretical to speak of any regeneration but what takes place at baptism. Without doubt, then, the Popish system of pardon and indulgence is in effect nothing less than an indulgence to commit sin.

The matter comes shortly to this issue;—Popery professes to grant pardon of sin, and to release from the punishment which it deserves, while men are yet in love with sin, and thirsting for the commission of it; while they are, as Bellarmine says, accustomed to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment of their lives, and in the practice of committing every crime. Pardons and indulgences granted to such, and while they continue such, must be an encouragement to wickedness. But the gospel of Christ professes to grant pardon to the chief of sinners along with a new heart—along with a hatred of sin, and a love of righteousness,

with the continual presence of the Holy Spirit to lead them in the way of holiness. This cannot be an indulgence to commit sin; it is a doctrine according to godliness. The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously in this present evil world. (See Titus ii. 11, 12.) The gospel performs all that it promises. It produces therefore real holiness of life. He that receives it is created after Christ Jesus unto good works, (Eph. ii. 10.) Let not Papists therefore lay the pernicious consequences of their own errors at the door of divine mercy. The salvation of the gospel is salvation *from sin* as well as from punishment: this is worthy of God. The indulgence of the Papist professes to release from punishment men who are full of all iniquity, and who cannot cease from sin: this is the delusion of the devil.

The language of divine mercy to sinners is,—and it is verified in all who believe in Christ,—“Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.”—“I will save you from all your uncleannesses.”—“Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your own sight, for your iniquities, and for your abominations.” (Ezek. xxxvi. 25—31.) “This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days saith the Lord; I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least even to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more.” (Heb. viii. 10—12.)

In these divine promises it is provided that he whose sins are pardoned shall be truly penitent. He shall loathe himself in his own sight: that he shall be cleansed from the pollution, as well as saved from the guilt, of sin.—He shall be sprinkled with clean water, and shall be clean; that is, he shall enjoy the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit: that the law of God shall be written in his heart, and he shall be enabled in some measure to keep it: that, in short, a new heart and a right spirit being given to him, he shall live the rest of his life in the fear of God. Such a dis-

pensation of grace and holiness can never operate as an indulgence to commit sin.

But the popish system possesses none of these qualities. Let my popish readers, therefore, who seek no other pardon than that which their priests can give, seriously consider, whether it will be such as will acquit them before the Judge of the whole world, when none will be accepted but those who have fled for refuge to the blood of atonement, and who have been born again,—born of water and of the Spirit; that is, made subjects of the gracious sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost.

Indulgences which were not merely remissions of sin for the living, but releases from purgatory for the dead, were, it seems, devised by Urban II. as recompenses for crusaders to the holy land. They were afterwards granted to all who gave money for other popish purposes. The sums so got, however, were often applied to other uses than those avowed. John XXII. reduced this traffic into a system; Leo X. tried it on a still larger scale as the means of replenishing his treasury.

Leo published that general sale of indulgences, which more immediately led to such important consequences. The papal briefs for this purpose were expedited in 1514 and 1515; but the sale did not commence till 1516 and 1517.

“Leo,” says Guicciardini, “following the advice of Cardinal Pucci, had spread throughout the world the amplest indulgences, not only for the benefit of the living, but also with power to loose the souls of the dead from purgatory: which things having in themselves neither probability nor authority, (it being notorious that they were granted solely to extort money from those who had more simplicity than prudence,) and being, besides, exercised most impudently by the commissioners deputed to this exaction, (the greatest part of whom purchased from the court the power of exercising them,) had excited in many places great indignation and scandal, especially in Germany, where *faculties for liberating the souls of the dead from purgatory were sold at a trifling price, or made the stakes of gambling in taverns.* On this occasion, the reason avowed was the expense of the war against the Turks, and of finishing the church of St Peter. “The money, however,” says Mr Bower, in his Life of Luther, “went to neither purpose, but was lavished in gratifying the luxury of the court of Rome, and of its dependents.” A more productive scheme of fraud never was devised. Throughout Europe, these indulgences were so eagerly sought for by the previously blinded and bigoted people, that even popish kings and governments complained bitterly that the popes drained their kingdoms of money.

THE
Protestant,

No. XIX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21st, 1818.

IN my last Number I endeavoured to show that the doctrine of indulgences, as taught by the Douay Catechism, has a natural tendency to encourage the commission of sin. I proceed now to answer the question of AMICUS VERITATIS, with regard to indulgences, which, he says, are granted by Protestant Churches, and particularly by the Church of Scotland, as I understand him to mean in the following passage:—"I shall next ask your Correspondent, Did not the Protestant Church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall his recollection to the notorious *cutty stool*, whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might be, and often was, exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?"

If I were to argue like a Papist, I would say, that it never was a doctrine of the Church of Scotland, that a sum of money should be received from a sinner as a commutation for the necessary discipline of the Church. It is certain that I have not been able to find such a doctrine in any of her public standards. I might, therefore, dismiss the subject with a broad denial; and maintain that there was no such thing. But I could not conceal from myself, or from the world, the plain fact, that facts are against me; and

my Popish opponents might bring, perhaps, five hundred credible witnesses to testify that their pockets had suffered, that their persons might escape the shame of a public exposure. Now, whatever a Papist, who does not value his reputation, might say on such an occasion, I frankly confess that I could not endure the shame of denying what is well known to be true; and though the same could not be a doctrine of the Church of Scotland, if it has become a pretty general practice, I must hold it as good as a doctrine; and whether the thing be right or wrong, its existence will not be denied.

I admit, therefore, that of late years, a practice has crept into this church which *resembles* that of the Church of Rome; or which at least resembles that in which indulgences originated. Up to the twelfth century, it appears from Dupin, that public penance was enjoined for public sins. During this century it became rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained by other ways, chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages: and writing of the fifteenth century, he says indulgences granted by the Pope were more common than ever,—they had become a kind of traffic, meaning that they could be had for money. The reader will observe it is the *remission of sins* of which Dupin speaks, and not the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven, as the Douay Catechism has it; and Dupin, a Popish historian of great note, must have known the doctrine of his church, at least as well as the Douay doctors. Now, in this respect, there is nothing in the practice of the Church of Scotland which in the least resembles that of Rome. The former never professed to forgive sins for money, though they do hold and declare the evangelical doctrine of forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ, to all who really repent, and absolve from church censures those who have come under them, and have given evidence of their repentance. It is on the point of public penance, as it is called, and of releasing the sinner from this, in consideration of something else, that I think there is a resemblance of that in which the Popish indulgences originated. The mode of censure enjoined for a certain sin in Scotland, is to be rebuked by the minister, in the presence of the congregation; but I believe, in most cases, the sinner is now exempted from this on paying a sum of money to the poor.

I do not know whence it comes, that only one species of sin is generally understood to incur the above sentence. In former times, any gross immorality subjected the sinner to the same discipline. In the early days of the Church of Scotland, to give countenance to Popery was considered a gross immorality, and incurred the public censure of the church. “The Countess of Argyle,” for instance, “being cited to appear before the

(General) Assembly, for assisting the baptism of the King, (James VI.) and giving her presence at the Papistical rites then used, did submit herself to censure, and was ordained to make public satisfaction in the chapel of Stirling, where the offence was committed, upon a Sunday after sermon, in such manner, and at such time, as the Superintendant of Lothian should appoint." *Spotswood, page 214.*

I should like to see such members of the Church of Scotland, in the present day, as have given countenance to Popish worship in Clyde Street, brought to a state of mind like that of the worthy Countess; and make public satisfaction before their respective congregations.

But to return to the proper subject of this Number; admitting it to be as AMICUS VERITATIS asserts, I am not accountable for it. My work was not undertaken with the view of defending the Church of Scotland, or any other church. I took my stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of my religion; and what I find not authorised by the Bible, if it should be in the church of which I am a member, or any other, I am ready to disavow it as antichristian. Popery had taken so fast a hold of the human mind throughout all Europe; it had insinuated itself so much into all the feelings, and principles, and practices, of the people; its influence has so descended from one generation to another; and it has become so interwoven with our modes of thinking, and speaking, and acting, that I question if there be any visible organized church in the world that does not possess less or more of the antichristian leaven. When the cry shall be made, "Babylon the great is fallen! is fallen!" there will be found, perhaps, some in every church, "crying, alas! alas!" for something that they have lost.

But with regard to the point in hand, I am not guilty of self-commendation when I say, that I consider the Church of Scotland to be, in constitution and doctrine, nearer the divine pattern exhibited in the Bible, than any other established church in the world. And, perhaps, I may say it to the praise of this church, that I am sure I give no offence to any of her members when I say, that I do not look upon her as perfect or infallible. Neither will it be offensive to the candid and enlightened part of that body, that I give my opinion against that part of her practice, the commuting of public censure for a pecuniary mulct; that I consider this antichristian; that, in short, it came from Rome, and the sooner it is sent back the better.

I do not object to the imposition of a fine. The sin to which this discussion refers, is a crime against the state, as it is subversive of the good order and happiness of civil society. It is,

therefore, a proper subject of punishment by the civil magistrate, either by fine or otherwise. It seems to have been so understood, in the reign of James VI. when the following severe law was made against it:—

“ All persons who commit the filthy vice of fornication, and are convicted thereof, shall be punished in manner following: for the first fault, the man, as well as the woman, shall pay the sum of forty pounds (Scotch, I suppose), otherwise both shall be imprisoned for the space of eight days, and be fed on bread and small drink, and afterwards shall be presented at the market-place of the town or parish bare-headed, and there stand fastened for the space of two hours: For the second fault, they shall pay the sum of an hundred merks, otherwise the days of their imprisonment shall be doubled, and their food shall be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be presented at the market-place, and the heads of both shall be shaven: For the third fault, they shall pay an hundred pounds, or else their imprisonment shall be tripled, and their food be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be taken to the deepest and foulest pool of water of the town or parish, and be there thrice dowed, and afterwards banished the town or parish for ever. The pecunial pains which shall be received, shall be kept in a close box, and converted *ad pios usus* in the parts where the crime was committed.” James VI. 1567, 1649-12.

“ All laws and acts of Parliament against fornication and uncleanness renewed and confirmed.” W. and M. 1690.

“ All laws and acts of Parliament against fornication and profaneness again revived and ratified, and persons guilty of it ordained to be prosecuted, and the fines imposed to be instantly paid to the parish collectors for the poor, or the party to be imprisoned till sufficient caution be found for the payment of them; and no pretence of different persuasions in matters of religion, shall screen the delinquent from being censured and punished for such immoralities.” W. 1696, Oct. 9th.—*Purdivan*, p. 224; *edit.* 1802.

Thus the crime was viewed in a civil light, and civil pains and penalties were imposed. Whether the penalties were in all instances worthy of the dignity of legal enactment, is another question. By sundry Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, as referred to by PURDIVAN, especially those of 1707, I find that swearing, cursing, profaning the Lord's day, and drunkenness, are mentioned, as well as fornication, as incurring church censures. Persons guilty of such crimes were to be publicly rebuked. It was not absolutely necessary that the guilty person should be advanced to a seat of peculiar eminence, though in most churches there was a seat for the purpose, and, perhaps,

in most instances, it was occupied on such occasions; yet it was declared to be sufficient, if there were satisfactory evidences of repentance, that the persons should profess the same, and receive the rebuke, in the seat in which he ordinarily heard the word preached. *Purd. p. 191.*

Now so far as the church was concerned in dealing with sinners on account of scandal, I can find nothing that authorises the modern practice of accepting a fine in lieu of public rebuke. The doctrine of the church is founded on the words of the Apostle, "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear," (1 Tim. v. 20.) Neither the Church of Scotland, nor the Apostle, on whose authority they proceeded, thought of restricting this rule to one species of sin: and I believe as little did they think that a profession of repentance, on account of any sin, should be dispensed with for money. *

A Popish indulgence releases the temporal punishment due to sin, and it is granted for money. A Papist now accuses the Church of Scotland of doing the same, because for money persons are released from public censure, which is understood to be a temporal punishment for sin; and I am sorry, that Papists should see any thing in Protestant churches, that bears the smallest resemblance to their own corruptions.

As I am afraid great mistakes prevail on this subject, among various denominations of Christians, I shall take the liberty of stating what I think may be gathered from the word of God, in relation to it. I am, of course, as liable to be mistaken as any body else, and I wish to speak with diffidence. The subject is important, and I shall not have written in vain, if I shall be the means of drawing to it the attention of enlightened Protestants.

I think the church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever. I use the word *punishment*, in the sense of Dr Johnson,—“Any infliction or pain imposed in vengeance of a crime;” and such at least is its meaning among Papists, in relation to indulgences. The reign of Christ in his church, is the reign of grace and mercy. He has, indeed, in his hand a rod of iron; but that is to rule in the midst of his enemies, and he will break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, (Ps. ii.) But his reign in the church possesses a character of benignity and loving kindness. No such thing, as punishment properly so called, can emanate from the throne of mercy.

Christ has appointed a government, or rule in his church, to be administered by his servants in his name. The character of this government must correspond with that of the reign of grace,

* The General Assembly, August, 1575, decreed that great or rich men, being guilty of crimes, should be censured even alike as poor men; and that no dispensation should be granted them for money, though *ad pias usu.* *Petries' Ch. Hist.* part 3d.

for it is virtually the government of Christ himself by his word. Those who rule in the church according to this word, must exhibit the compassion and the gentleness of Christ. While they maintain great firmness, and even boldness, in opposing the enemies of truth and godliness, not for their hurt or punishment, but for their good also, they must be particularly careful that they administer nothing of the nature of punishment to those whom they acknowledge as their Master's friends.

Through infirmity and temptation, Christians often fall into sin, and thereby dishonour the cause of truth which they maintain. If it be a sin which is followed by scandal, or by occasion of which true religion suffers reproach, Christ has ordained that the sinner should be told his fault faithfully and plainly. If it be known only to a few, these few are authorised to forgive him, if they see such evidences of repentance as make them believe that God has forgiven him. If the sin be known to the church or congregation, then the evidence of the sinner's repentance ought also to be known to the church,—he ought to be admonished or reproved by the minister in their presence, and exhorted to beware, in future, lest he fall into sin, which is his own greatest enemy. If he does not profess sorrow for his sin,—if he gives no evidence of repentance after repeated admonition, and exhortation, and prayer on his behalf, the church has nothing farther to do but to put him away.

In this there is nothing of the nature of punishment. It is a process of kindness and brotherly love. It is a precept as old as the law of Moses, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother, and not suffer sin upon him." (Lev. xix. 17.) The Psalmist speaks of such discipline as an excellent oil that would not hurt him. He calls it even a kindness done to him; and such it truly is to all who need it, and to whom it is affectionately administered. It is the ordinance of Christ intended for the gracious purpose of showing his people the great evil of sin, and deterring them from the commission of it. Like every other divine ordinance, it is profitable for the purpose intended by it. How many have had occasion to thank God for such expressions of his kindness, and the kindness of his people to themselves, or to others of whose penitence and restoration they have been witnesses! That there is nothing of *punishment* in this, is decidedly the opinion of the Church of Scotland, as her discipline is expounded by STUART OF PURDIVAN. "A public rebuke," says he, "ought to be so managed, that there be no ground given for constructing it a *penance*, *punishment*, or mark of reproach, but the minister is to carry therein, as one much affected and afflicted with the sin."—In short, the whole process, if conducted according to the word of God, and the mind of the Church of Scotland as above declared, is an expression of the kindness of the Head of the church towards his people, in order to recover them from sin, and preserve them

from falling into it. But to dispense with this, and make a man pay for the dispensation, is to injure him, not so much by the fine, as by depriving him of the merciful discipline which Christ appointed for his spiritual benefit.

If it be objected, that most persons would rather pay the fine than submit to the discipline and reproof, I answer, this indicates a bad state of mind in such persons. I should doubt that they had not repented of their sin. I should be afraid that they did not really belong to the kingdom of Him, of whose gracious reign I have been speaking. It would then serve no good purpose to deal with them according to the laws of that kingdom, farther than to set before them plainly and faithfully their guilt and danger; and if after all, they did not repent, to put them away from the communion of the church of which they show themselves to be unworthy.

Most people would conceive this to be punishment; but in reality it is no such thing. Excommunication in the Church of Rome is indeed a dreadful engine employed for the punishment of those who offend the Holy See; and I am afraid that many Protestants have derived their ideas of excommunication from Rome. I do not say, it is not a dreadful thing, as administered according to the word of God, because it really is so; but all that is dreadful in it arises from the state of mind of the individual who incurs the sentence, not from the sentence itself. It is never lawfully executed, but in cases of obstinate perseverance in wickedness, and refusing to repent. Nothing can be imagined more dreadful than this. Such rebellion against the authority of God, shows that one is not fit for the kingdom of God; and putting him out of the church is doing him no injury; it is no punishment; it is indeed all the benefit which the church can confer upon him; it is calculated to convince him of his sin, and it prevents him from committing greater sin, by continuing to profane divine ordinances. In short, there is nothing in it that affects the person or the property of the individual. His personal and civil rights remain untouched. He is deprived of nothing but the fellowship of saints, a thing for which he has no value, a thing which, indeed, he despises, else he would not prefer the pleasures of sin.

I am aware that on this subject the apostle Paul uses strong language. He speaks of excommunication as a delivering over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh (1 Cor. v. 5.); from which there is a vulgar idea prevalent, that the church claims the power of delivering individuals into the hands of the devil, to be tormented; but the words really mean no more than turning persons over to that society or class of men to which they belong. There are only two kingdoms on earth:—the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of Satan. The former is the church, the latter is the

world. The members of the former are gathered out of the latter; they are separated from the world, and added to the Church by the faith of the gospel. Many, by false pretences, have been joined to the Church; but when this is discovered, as it is by their committing sin, and obstinately refusing to repent, then, by the authority of Christ, declared by his Apostle, such persons are to be delivered over to that kingdom from which they came, from which they were never truly separated, and to which they are still cordially attached, as is evident by their love of sin: this is giving them over to Satan, their own master, the god of this world, who ruleth in the children of disobedience. This is precisely the view of the passage entertained by the Church of Scotland, as appears by the following extract from PURDIVAN, *Art. Excom.* 6. 10. "Why the Apostle (1 Cor. v. 5.) expresses excommunication by delivering unto Satan, may be for this, among other reasons, that Satan is called the god of this world, as world is taken in opposition to the church of God; so that delivering to him, implies no more than that (Matth. xviii. 17.) "if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and publican," thereby letting us know how dreadful a thing it is to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salvation, and exposed to the temptations of our grand adversary the devil." Still there is nothing here of the nature of punishment properly so called,—nothing done in vengeance of a crime; and one cannot be said to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salvation, unless he shall voluntarily withdraw from hearing the gospel preached, from which he is by no means excluded by excommunication.

I am aware, also, that the word punishment is used by our translators in reference to excommunication, 2 Cor. ii. 6. but it is used only in that limited sense which signifies rebuke or chastisement. It does not mean any thing that is *penal*, or inflicted in *vengeance* of a crime. The original word *ἐπιτιμία* is indeed rendered *rebuke* in all the other English translations to which at present I have access. The authorised version of Queen Elizabeth is,—“It is sufficient unto the same man that he was *rebuked* of many.” The Rhemish translation is,—“To him that is such a one, this *rebuke* sufficeth that is given of many.”

THE

Protestant,

No. XX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28th, 1818.

AN indulgence, according to the Douay Catechism, is a releasing of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. From this it is evident that the Church of Rome claims the power of inflicting temporal punishment; and that she has often done so is proved by her history. In my last Number I endeavoured to show that the Church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever; and that there is nothing of the nature of punishment in any part of her administration, even with regard to offenders. I believe I might even take higher ground and maintain that in days of primitive purity, the discipline of the church, and public rebuke, when the occasion required it, were considered privileges. When a person had been left to fall into sin, and to give offence to his brethern, he had no peace in his own mind till the offence was removed. He came, therefore, to the church begging that he might be allowed, by public profession of his sorrow, to do away, as much as possible, the offence which he had given; and to have refused him this favour, not the granting of it, would have been a punishment. In short, the whole discipline of the church, even when it extends to the excommunication of a member, is a process of mercy and kindness to the individual, and to the church. If this be a fair exhibition of the law of Christ, as I think it will be found to be on a careful examination of the New Testament, then whatever is opposed to this must be antichristian, and of this I am again about to convict the Church of Rome.

Excommunication is simply to separate from communion. The members of the Church of Christ have a mutual participation of certain privileges which are common to them all, as Christians,

and of which none but Christians can participate. I use the word Christian in the New Testament sense, as denoting separation from the world, and union to Christ by the faith of the gospel. Such persons only can have communion with Christ, and with one another, in a spiritual sense, as members of his body. When one has professed to be a Christian, and has been admitted to the communion of Christians, but afterwards makes it evident, by sinful conduct, and refusing to be reclaimed, that he is not what he professed to be, he is put away, as one who cannot possibly enjoy Christian communion, but who under the semblance of it, must injure himself, and mar the comfort of the church. This I take to be all that is meant by excommunication.

But the Church of Rome makes use of this as an engine of cruelty and oppression, and for the purpose of extending and maintaining her dominion over the kings and kingdoms of this world. This of itself is antichristian. Christ, when on earth, did not claim authority in temporal matters. He gave no commission to his Apostles to do so; nay, he positively forbade them; and told them that his kingdom was not of this world. But the Church of Rome, or rather the Pope as her head, claims dominion over the whole earth, and all things in it. Though this authority were exercised ever so mildly, and ever so much for the good of the human race, the very claim is antichristian, because it is opposed to the plain command of Christ.

I do not suppose it possible that an authority usurped contrary to the will of God, can be exercised for the glory of God or the good of men; but as a mere speculation, let us suppose for a moment that it were so. Let us imagine to ourselves the Head of the Romish Church deeply interested for the happiness of the human race, and exercising his unlimited powers to promote good order, and peace, and civilization, throughout the world; and that the only instrument he made use of for this purpose was excommunication. We should then find him restraining ambition, regulating the government of princes, and compelling them to rule for the good of their subjects. No one would dare to oppress the weak, to make war upon his neighbour, or shed the blood of his own subjects, under pain of being excommunicated, and overwhelmed by the anathemas which the Pope held in his hand for the correction or destruction of his rebellious children.

Now, the very reverse of this has been the practice of the Holy Father of Rome, as is demonstrated by the history of Europe for more than a thousand years. He professed to have the keys of heaven and hell in his own hands, to open and shut at his pleasure. But when was it known that he shut the gates of heaven, or opened those of hell, to any individual how-

ever wicked, though stained with every crime that man could commit, if he were but submissive to the Holy See? The fact is, men might murder their nearest relatives,—might lay waste whole provinces of unoffending neighbours by fire and sword, and live in the habitual practice of all possible wickedness, and yet enjoy full communion with the Church of Rome in all her sacraments, in all her privileges and honours, and in all her prospects of future happiness. But if any man called in question one iota of the Pope's authority, he was visited by all the terrors of excommunication;—and if the offender was a king, the whole nation suffered with him.

I might fill a volume with examples, but at present I shall give only that of England, in the reign of John, in the thirteenth century, as related by Hume, vol. 2d. chap. 4th. A king more wicked than John perhaps never sat on the throne of England. He disgusted the whole nation by his cruelties and debaucheries. It was not the least of his crimes, and perhaps not the greatest, that he murdered his nephew, Arthur, Duke of Brittany, with his own hand, for which he was detested by his subjects. There was, however, nothing in this, or in his other crimes, which gave any offence to the Holy See,—nothing that rendered him unworthy of her communion, or called forth the disapprobation of the Pope.

But on the occasion of a disputed election to the See of Canterbury, the Pope thought proper to nominate a creature of his own to that high office; and because the king would not consent to this, he let loose upon him, and upon the kingdom, all the terrors of an interdict and excommunication. It is amusing to observe how the Pope tried to cajole the king into compliance before he threatened him; he tried the cunning of the serpent before he had recourse to the roaring of the lion. “INNOCENT,” for such was the name of the Pope, “sensible that this flagrant usurpation would be highly resented by the court of England, wrote John a mollifying letter; sent him four golden rings, set with precious stones; and endeavoured to enhance the value of the present by informing him of the many mysteries implied in it. He begged him to consider seriously the *form* of the rings, their *number*, their *matter*, and their *colour*. Their form, he said, being round, shadowed out eternity, which had neither beginning nor end; and he ought thence to learn his duty of aspiring from earthly objects to heavenly, from things temporal to things eternal. The number four, being a square, denoted steadiness of mind, not to be subverted either by adversity or prosperity, fixed for ever on the firm basis of the four cardinal virtues. Gold, which is the matter, being the most precious of metals, signified wisdom, which is the most valuable of all accomplishments, and justly preferred by Solomon to riches, power, and all

exterior attainments. The blue colour of the sapphire represented Faith; the verdure of the emerald, Hope; the redness of the ruby, Charity; and the splendor of the topaz, Good Works. By these conceits, INNOCENT endeavoured to repay JOHN for one of the most important prerogatives of his crown which he had ravished from him."

John, instead of being mollified, was transported with rage; and refusing to yield to the will of his ghostly father, the dreadful sentence was pronounced against him. "The sentence of interdict was at that time the great instrument of vengeance and policy employed by the court of Rome; was denounced against sovereigns for the lightest offences; and made the guilt of one person involve the ruin of millions, even in their spiritual and eternal welfare. The execution of it was calculated, in the highest degree, to strike the senses, and to operate with irresistible force on the minds of the people. The nation was of a sudden deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion. The altars were despoiled of their ornaments: the crosses, the relicks, the images, the statues of the saints, were laid on the ground; and as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all the churches: the bells themselves were removed from the steeples, and laid on the ground, with other sacred utensils. Mass was celebrated with shut doors, and none but the priests were admitted to that holy institution. The laity partook of no religious rite, except baptism to new born infants, and the communion of the dying. The dead were not interred in consecrated ground: they were thrown into ditches, or buried in common fields; and their obsequies were not attended with prayers or any hallowed ceremony. Marriage was celebrated in the churchyards; and that every action in life might bear the marks of this dreadful situation, the people were prohibited the use of meat, as in lent, or times of the highest penance; were debarred from all pleasures and entertainments; and were forbidden even to salute each other, or so much as to shave their beards, and give any decent attention to their person and apparel. Every circumstance carried symptoms of the deepest distress, and of the most immediate apprehension of divine vengeance and indignation.

"The king that he might oppose *his* temporal to *their* spiritual terrors, immediately, from his own authority, confiscated the estates of all the clergy who obeyed the interdict."—"And, in order to distress the clergy in the tenderest point, and at the same time expose them to reproach and ridicule, he threw into prison all their concubines, and required high fines as the price of their liberty."

This state of things continued for some years; for though

the people hated their king, it does not appear that they were in love with the Pope, or that they wished his plans of ambition to succeed so as to enslave their country. The interdict, therefore, not producing the desired effect upon England, the Pope at last issued the sentence of excommunication. Then, indeed, JOHN began to feel the misery of his situation. No civil or military officer would serve under an excommunicated king. Bishops and barons left the kingdom; and the wretched monarch was left without support. Still, however, he kept his place; and the Pope had recourse to the next step in the gradation of papal penances, "which was to absolve his subjects from their oaths of fidelity and allegiance, and to declare every one excommunicated who had any commerce with him in public or in private, at his table, in his council, or even in private conversation. And this sentence was accordingly, with all imaginable solemnity, pronounced against him." Here is a striking instance of the Pope not only granting permission to commit sin, but actually commanding it. He required the people of England to violate their oaths of allegiance, not because the king had violated his oath to them, but because he refused to surrender his independence to the Pope, who had no just right to such a surrender.

"But as JOHN still persevered in his contumacy, there remained nothing but the sentence of deposition; which, though intimately connected with the former, had been distinguished from it by the artifice of the Court of Rome; and INNOCENT determined to dart this last thunderbolt against the refractory monarch. But as a sentence of this kind required an armed force to execute it, the Pontiff, casting his eyes around, fixed at last on Philip, king of France, as the person into whose powerful hand he could most properly intrust that weapon, the ultimate resource of his ghostly authority. And he offered the monarch, besides the remission of all his sins, and endless spiritual benefits, the property and possession of the kingdom of England as the reward of his labours."

And, truly, these fine promises were all the reward that Philip got; for after raising a great army, and collecting 1700 vessels, at a monstrous expense, for the invasion of England, JOHN, reduced to despair, was moved at last to make his submission, and to deliver up his kingdom into the hands of his ghostly father, to be for ever after at his disposal. Then the Pope by his legate, told Philip to dismiss his army, and let England alone, because John "had now come to a just sense of his guilt; had returned to obedience under the Apostolic See, and even consented to do homage to the Pope for his dominions; and having thus made his kingdom a part of St. Peter's patrimony had rendered it impossible for any Christian prince, with

out the most manifest and most flagrant impiety, to attack him." Thus the Pope swindled kings out of their wealth, and kingdoms out of their independence, by means of his sentence of excommunication.

The following is the form of this sentence, as used on ordinary occasions. The original Latin may be seen in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, ART. *Excom.* "In name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of our blessed and most holy Lady Mary; also by the power of the Angels, Archangels, &c. WE separate M. and N. from the bosom of the holy mother church, and condemn them with the anathema of a perpetual malediction. And may they be cursed in the city, cursed in the field, cursed be their barn, and cursed be their store, cursed be the fruit of their womb and the fruit of their land, cursed be their coming in and going out. Let them be cursed in the house, and fugitives in the field: and let all the curses come upon them which the Lord by Moses threatened to bring on the people who forsook the divine law; and let them be anathema maranatha, that is, let them perish at the second coming of the Lord. Let no Christian say an *Ave* to them. Let no priest presume to celebrate mass with them, or give them the holy communion. Let them be buried with the burial of an ass, and be dung upon the face of the earth. And as these lights are this day cast out of our hands and extinguished, so let their light be put out for ever, unless they repent, and by amendment and condign penance, make satisfaction to the church of God which they have injured."

There were, however, extraordinary occasions, and extraordinary offenders, who required extraordinary forms of cursing. I believe the most masterly piece of the kind extant, is that which is given in my fifth Number. Queen Elizabeth of England was a great eye-sore to the Pope, insomuch that he made a special act of cursing and excommunication on her account, which is as follows:—

"The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth, Queen of England, and her adherents, with an addition of other punishments. Pius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam.*

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, committed one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church (out of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely, to Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fullness of power. Him alone he made prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, to destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may contain the faithful that are knit together

with the band of charity in the unity of the Spirit, and present them spotless and unblameable to their Saviour.

“ § 1. In discharge of which function, we, which are by God's goodness called to the government of the said church, do spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity, and the Catholic religion (which the Author thereof hath, for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be punished with so great afflictions), might be preserved uncorrupt. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, there is now no place left in the whole world which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines; amongst others, ELIZABETH, the pretended Queen of England, a slave of wickedness, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious of all men have found a refuge. This very woman, having seized on the kingdom, and monstrously usurping the place of supreme head of the church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again brought back the said kingdom into miserable destruction, which was then newly reduced to the Catholic faith and good fruits.

“ § 2. For having by strong hand inhibited the exercise of the true religion, which MARY, lawful queen, of famous memory, had by the help of this See restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by HENRY the Eighth, a revolter therefrom; and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men being heretics; oppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith; placed unpious preachers, ministers of iniquity; abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies; commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy; and impious mysteries and institutions by herself entertained, and observed according to the prescript of CALVIN, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presuming to throw bishops, parsons of churches, and other Catholic priests, out of their churches and benefices, and to bestow them and other church livings upon heretics, and to determine of church causes; prohibited the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or obey the precepts and canonical sanctions thereof; compelled most of them to condescend to her wicked laws, and to abjure the authority and obedience of the bishop of Rome, and to acknowledge her to be sole lady in temporal and spiritual matters, and this by oath; imposed penalties and punishments upon those who obeyed not, and exacted them of those who persevered in the unity of the faith and obedience aforesaid cast the Catholic prelates and rectors of churches in prison, where many of them being spent with long languishing and sorrow

miserably ended their lives. All which things, seeing they are manifest and notorious to all nations, and by the gravest testimony of very many so substantially proved, that there is no place at all left for excuse, defence, or evasion.

“ § 3. We, seeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied one upon another; and moreover, that the persecution of the faithful, and affliction for religion, groweth every day heavier and heavier, through the instigation and means of the said ELIZABETH; because we understand her mind to be so hardened and indurate, that she hath not only condemned the godly requests and admonitions of Catholic princes, concerning her healing and conversion, but also hath not so much as permitted the nuncios of this See, to cross the seas unto England; are strained of necessity to betake ourselves to the weapons of justice against her, not being able to mitigate our sorrow, that we are drawn to take punishment upon one, to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom hath been so much bounden. Being therefore supported by his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us, (though unable for so great a burden) in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our Apostolic power, declare the foresaid ELIZABETH, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ.

“ § 4. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.

“ § 5. And also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others, who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and to deprive the same ELIZABETH of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things abovesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her monitions, mandates, and laws: And those who do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of anathema.”

§ 6. Regards merely the publication of this Bull, for which I have not room. It is dated at Rome, at St. Peter's, May 5th, 1570, and the fifth year of Pope Pius V. The Bull itself in Latin and English, with a commentary by Bishop Barlow, forms a quarto volume, entitled “*Brutum Fulmen.*”

THE

Protestant,

No. XXI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5th, 1818.

MY last Number concluded with the "Damnation and Excommunication" of Queen Elizabeth, by Pope Pius V. One of the first things that will strike the reader, on perusing this document, is the unparalleled insolence of the ghostly father. Elizabeth and her kingdom did not choose to have any thing to do with him; and what right had he to issue his anathemas against them? King John had, indeed, made a gift of the kingdom to the Pope about two hundred and fifty years before. But as John had presumed to give away what was not his own, (for even, at that early period, the people of England understood and maintained the principle, that the king was made for the people, not the people for the king;) and as the Pope had obtained the gift by means of imposition, it was in course of time lawfully wrested from him. In short, Pius V. had no more right to curse Queen Elizabeth, than Pius VII. has to curse King George the Third.

The enlightened part of the English population were, in a great measure, prepared for a change in the public profession of religion, before King Henry VIII. was prepared to lead the way. The doctrines of the word of God, as taught by Wickliffe and the Lollards, a century before, were extensively propagated, and many thousands in England believed them; so that when Henry himself became Reformer, he found little difficulty, except with

some of the clergy and nobility, in getting the people to go along with him. Indeed, his chief difficulty arose from the forwardness of the people, who were disposed to reform faster, and more thoroughly, than he chose to allow them, and to go farther from Rome than he chose to go. He did, however, go far enough to incur the anger of the Pope, whose predecessor had created him Defender of the Faith; not being able, with all his infallibility, to foresee that Henry would soon renounce the faith, and that this fine title should be borne for three hundred years by a race of heretical princes; and the Pope, whose misfortune it was to hear of the defection of Henry, assailed him with all the terrors of the Holy See, by means of a Bull which is before me, and which fills fifteen quarto pages of closely printed Latin, under the title of *Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrici VIII. Regis Angliæ*. The Pope was evidently very angry with the king. He declared him, by this Bull, to be a heretic, and his crime was greatly aggravated by the consideration of his having been stiled Defender of the Faith. He excommunicated and deposed him. He commanded all Christian princes to take up arms against him. He gave the soldiers who should engage in so godly a work, all the goods of the heretics, wherever they could find them. The king, notwithstanding, maintained his ground, and maintained the Reformation too, so far as he chose to carry it; and had he carried it a great deal farther, he should have had not only the support but the gratitude of the people.

By Elizabeth's time, it was carried a little farther forward; and the great bulk of the nation were decidedly Protestants, that is, decided in their separation from Rome, and in attachment to Elizabeth and her government. The interference of the Pope, therefore, was no better than the attempt of an incendiary to sow discord, and excite war and bloodshed, in a great and prosperous nation. He persevered in such attempts for many years, both openly and secretly, and employed numerous agents for carrying into effect his insidious and cruel designs. In short, it is difficult to imagine a fiend of darkness more obstinately set upon promoting measures of wickedness and cruelty than this holy father of the Romish church; and yet I believe he was not worse than the average of Popes for a thousand years.

He took other measures, besides denouncing the Queen, for subverting the government of England. He wrote a letter to the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against their sovereign. This letter, of which an English translation is given in "Free Thoughts," page 401, is written in the most insidious and flattering style. He addresses the two Earls as "men dear to us and eminent, as well by the study of catholic piety, as by nobleness of birth." He praises their

for having determined “to renew and confirm the ancient union of the Roman church with that kingdom,”—“delivered from the vile servitude of a woman’s lust, to the ancient obedience of the holy Roman See.” He assures them “that the omnipotent God, whose works are perfect, and who hath excited you to deserve well of the Catholic faith in that kingdom, will be assisting to you. But if, in asserting the Catholic faith, and the authority of this holy See, you should suffer death, and your blood be spilt, it would be much better, for the confession of God, to fly, by the compendium of a glorious death, to life eternal, than, living basely and ignominiously, to serve the lust of an impotent woman, with the loss of your souls.” It is worthy of remark, that this letter is dated Feb. 20th, 1570, that is, about three months previous to the issuing of the Bull against the Queen. This was giving the rebel Earls time to collect their forces, that they might be ready to strike the blow, and dethrone the Queen, when the Bull should arrive, and when all the superstitious and Popish part of the nation should be afraid to serve an excommunicated sovereign. The rebellion, however, had broken out prematurely, perhaps before the Pope’s Bull arrived, and it was soon suppressed.

Some years after, the Pope excited Sir Thomas Stuckley to raise rebellion in Ireland. Stuckley engaged to conquer this kingdom for the Pope; and the holy father furnished him with a number of crucifixes, by selling which he was to make his own fortune. The following indulgences were granted to these crucifixes, which were evidently meant to excite the subjects of Elizabeth to rebel against her.

“1st. Whoso beholdeth, with reverence and devotion, one of these crosses, as oft as he doth it getteth fifty days of indulgence. As oft as he prayeth upon or before it, for the good and prosperous state of the holy Catholic church, and for the increase and exaltation of the holy Catholic faith, and for the preservation and delivery of Mary Queen of Scotland, and for the extirpation of heretics, he shall have fifty days of indulgence, and, upon festival days, one hundred.

“2d. In going to any conflict or feat of arms, against the enemies of our holy faith, he shall obtain seven years and seven quarantains of indulgence. And if he die there, at least being confessed and houseled at the beginning of the war, with contrition of his sins, and calling upon the name of Jesus with mouth or heart, he shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

“3d. As oft as he shall be confessed and houseled, making his prayers by word or mind, before the most holy crucifix, and praying for the prosperous state of the holy church, and

for the chief Bishop; and for the delivery and preservation of the aforesaid Mary Queen of Scots, and for reducing of the aforesaid realms of England and Scotland, he shall obtain all the indulgences that are granted for visiting all the holy places that are both within and without the gates of Rome.

“ 4th. Any night or evening that he shall examine his own conscience, with repentance of sins, and intend to amend the same, saying the general confession, and bowing or kneeling before the holy crucifix, saying three times JESUS, obtains a year and a quarantain of indulgence.

“ 5th. Whoso shall use and accustom to behold it with devotion to the cross, saying five Paternosters, five Aves, and some other prayers to our Saviour, or to our Lady, for the exaltation of the holy church, for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scotland, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, he shall obtain once in his life full indulgence of all his sins, besides the other indulgence of fifty days for each time that he prayeth.

“ 6th. Moreover, in the pain and peril of death, what person soever being confessed and contrite, or giving signs of contrition, and shall kiss the feet of the most blessed crucifix, saying, JESU with heart, not being able to say it with mouth, shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

“ 7th, *Item*. One day in the year, named and appointed by them that shall have one of the said crucifixes, with the license of the ordinary of the place, it may be put in any church, or chapel, or oratory; and whosoever shall come to visit with devotion the said holy crucifix, in the said church, chapel, or oratory, saying five Paternosters, and five Aves, praying for the prosperous state of our church, and for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scots, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, shall obtain free indulgence of all their sins, being confessed, or having the mind and purpose to be confessed in due time or place, and to amend their former lives and sins.

“ 8th, *Item*. That every Friday that mass is said, or caused to be said, upon any altar where one of these crucifixes is set, one soul shall be released out of purgatory.

“ *Item*. That those indulgences cannot be revoked by any high bishop, except express mention be made of the same.” *Stripe's Annals*, Vol. II. 1724. page 535.

Such were the artifices of the See of Rome for subverting the English government. The Pope excommunicated and deposed the Queen; relieved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance stirred up the disaffected by flattering promises; and sent a number of little idols in the form of crucifixes throughout Ireland, to cherish among the people the superstitious belief, that if they should die in so good a cause as attempting to dethrone a here-

tical queen, and deliver a Popish one, they should receive the free pardon of all their sins. These efforts were powerfully seconded by a host of Jesuit priests, who spread themselves all over the kingdom, and who never ceased to plot the destruction of the Queen, insomuch that it is truly astonishing that she escaped the fate of some other monarchs of that age, from the hands of these incendiaries.

“The reign of Elizabeth,” says the Reviewer of ‘A Brief Account of the Jesuits,’ in the Christian Observer for March, 1815, “displays a rapid succession of plots against her life, either designed or executed by Jesuits, and from which nothing but the peculiar protection of Providence could have delivered the Queen and the country.” The following is an extract from the Brief Account:—“Elizabeth wrote with her own hand to HENRY III. of France, after the conspiracy against her life, informing him that the Jesuits had contrived it, ‘who,’ says she, ‘hold it meritorious to kill a sovereign whom the Pope has deposed; and she then warns him against them; and he would have done well if he had observed her caution. In 1591, the Queen published a declaration against the society; in which, after describing at length the designs of Spain and Rome, she says, that she has the most undoubted information, that the Jesuits form the nests and lurking-places of those who are in rebellion against her person and government; that their general had himself been to Spain, and armed its king against her; that Parsons, who taught among them, and was the general of the English seminary at Rome, had done the same; and that the Jesuits, as a society, had been the life and soul of the armies which had been raised against England.” p. 22.

Now, let the reader reflect what sort of a religion that must be which has been uniformly employed for purposes of mischief; and which has scarcely ever made itself known in the world, but as the instrument of promoting some mischievous design. The religion of Jesus Christ has a direct tendency to promote the true happiness of the human race in this world as well as in the next. His appearing in this world was announced by an angel from heaven, as the commencement of a dispensation which should, in an eminent degree, produce glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace, and good will to men. This religion, wherever cordially embraced, has produced the promised effects. It brings peace to the conscience and heart of every sinner who believes it; and it teaches such a one to live in peace with all his neighbours. Congregations of such men are churches of Christ; and, while they are studying to edify and promote the happiness of one another, they look with a benign aspect upon the whole human race. Every such society creates around it a moral atmosphere,

which ameliorates the condition of all who are within its reach; and brings into operation the spirit of that religion which is divinely destined to banish discord and war from the earth, and promote the reign of universal peace.

Every thing that has an opposite tendency must be antichristian, that is, contrary to the religion of Christ. On this principle alone, I am willing to meet any advocate of the Romish church; and I engage to prove that her whole administration, as related in history, for twelve centuries, has been subversive of the peace and comfort of mankind; that, in fact, all the cunning, and artifice, and power, and wealth, and learning of those who conducted the affairs of the Church of Rome, have been devoted to purposes of deceit, and cruelty, and wholesale murder, either in the way of exciting princes to make war upon one another, or to exterminate heretics, or in the way of sowing the seeds of sedition and rebellion among people, against such princes as the Pope chose to denounce and excommunicate. He who believes this to be the true religion cannot have learned of Him who was meek and lowly in heart, and who came to proclaim peace on earth, and good will to men; but must have been brought up at the feet of some demon who delights in the misery of men, and whose altars are ever stained with the blood of human sacrifices.

Papists of the present day assume airs of humanity and moderation, and affect an abhorrence of such scenes as I have been describing; but they do so with a very ill grace, when they do it at the expense of denying almost every historical fact, and by asserting downright falsehood, as is done by the Editor of their *Orthodox Journal*, when he says that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till Protestants set the example; and when he maintains, as he does in his Number for October last, that Popery is more conducive to civil liberty than Protestantism, for which purpose he distorts, and turns upside down many facts of history, to impose upon his credulous readers. If modern Papists would honestly confess the truth, and deplore, and condemn, the conduct of the Church of Rome in former times, when she made it her business to excite war and massacre throughout all Europe, I should give them credit for possessing more humane and generous sentiments than their forefathers did; but while they rest the defence of their church upon the denial of well known facts, I must take them for liars as their fathers were; and I cannot help coming to the conclusion, that they would do just as their fathers did, if they were in similar circumstances, and possessed the same power.

I have before me a list of about sixty emperors, kings, and princes, who have been excommunicated, deposed, &c. by about forty different Popes. (*See Free Thoughts, p. 51.*) What an

inconceivable mass of misery must have been occasioned by this, and by the wars which ensued, to the millions of subjects, who were all less or more affected by the fate of their superiors ! Why is it that the present Pope does not excommunicate and denounce the king of Great Britain and the Prince Regent ? It is simply because he knows that it would not serve any profitable purpose ; and that it might be attended by some inconvenience to himself, if he were to denounce them *by name*. But, if ever the time shall come when the subjects of the Pope shall have the ascendancy here, the ghostly father will feel little reluctance in serving British princes as he did their predecessors. And, in fact, they are excommunicated already, though not by name, but by their well known designation of *heretics*. This is done annually at Rome, on holy Thursday, as by the following account in Hurd's History, p. 217 :—" The next ceremony is that of excommunicating and giving over to the devil, all Protestants throughout the world, who, at Rome, and among Roman Catholics, are known by the name of heretics. The Pope is then clothed in red, and stands upon a high throne, the better to be seen by the people. The sub-deacons, who stand at the left hand of his Holiness, read the bull, and, in the mean time, the candles are lighted, and each of them takes one in his hand. When the excommunication is pronounced, the Pope and Cardinals put out their candles, and throw them among the crowd, after which, the black cloth that covered the pulpit is taken away."

I have deviated a great way from the straight road through the Letters of AMICUS VERITATIS, for the purpose of contrasting the discipline and excommunication appointed by Christ in his church, with that exercised in the Church of Rome, by the Pope and his clergy ; and I hope it will appear from what I have written on this subject alone, that the Church of Rome is anti-christ,—that malignant power that maintains a perpetual opposition to the kingdom of Christ in the world.

I shall conclude this Number with another example of excommunication, as it is practised in the Church of Rome. It is difficult to understand what sort of communion the church held with vermin ; but certainly some sort of relation must have subsisted between them and the church, seeing they were liable to be excommunicated.

" But the Church of Rome does not confine her excommunications, or censures, entirely to men and women ; for even animals and reptiles must be subject in their turn. When it happens that much of the fruits of the earth are damaged by rats, mice, locusts, or caterpillars, then the church censures become necessary. The priest is obliged to transmit to the bishop an account of the damage done by these creatures, and then the

bishop orders the priest to repair to an eminence in his parish, where he is to put on his surplice, and sprinkle himself and his clerks with holy water. Having repeated some prayers prescribed by the bishop, the priest walks over the adjacent fields, and sprinkles them with holy water, in form of a cross. He commands the caterpillars, locusts, &c. to depart from the place immediately, otherwise they are to be excommunicated and accursed.

“Of this species of superstition we have a most striking instance in the Miscellanies of the Marquis D’Argens, who tells us, that, in the year 1738, Provence, in France, was much infested with locusts. Application was made to the Pope, who sent his bull to the bishop, ordering them to be all excommunicated. The bishop obeyed the order, but the locusts refused to comply, which gave no small uneasiness to the farmers; it surprised them much to find that the locusts refused to comply with the apostolical order; but one more sagacious than the others observed, that the bishop was a Jansenist.

“An account of this was transmitted to the Pope, who, from the whole of his conduct, seems not to have been a fool, for he sent an injunction to a bishop, who was orthodox in the faith, (a Jesuit perhaps) to let the locusts alone till the beginning of November, and then to go out with his priests and excommunicate them. Here the Pope acted a very wise part, for locusts seldom survive the first week in November; whereas, had he excommunicated them sooner, the ceremony would not have had its proper effect. This, however, was considered as a miracle, because it served to point out that the Jansenists are not to expect the divine blessing upon their works; whereas all those who are orthodox, are certain that God will hear them whenever they call upon him, and that he will in the most signal manner grant their requests.”—*Hurd’s History*, p. 229.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12th, 1818.

I HAVE been endeavouring, in some of my late Numbers, to represent the church of Christ and the Church of Rome, by way of contrast, particularly in the matters of discipline and excommunication. These, in the church of Christ, are a process of kindness and mercy;—in the Church of Rome, a system of cruelty and oppression. The utmost that the church of Christ can do with an offending and irreclaimable member, is to put him away; but this, even when represented by the apostle Paul, under the strong language of delivering unto Satan, is a process of mercy: it is declared to be “for the destruction of the flesh.” This last expression, “the flesh,” signifies the evil propensities of the human heart, the corrupt desires and passions, which, in a man, are the source of all his misery in this world; and which, if not destroyed, must issue in misery everlasting. That which effects such destruction is a process of mercy. It was effectual in the instance of the person of whom the apostle speaks, 1 Cor. v. and 2 Cor. ii. His being turned over to the world, which is the kingdom of Satan, and thus declared to be unworthy of the fellowship of the church, made him reflect on his own character and condition. Finding himself an outcast from the kingdom of Christ on earth, because of his wickedness, he could have no hope of seeing the kingdom of Christ in heaven, but must have been overwhelmed by a fearful apprehension of being sent away into everlasting punishment with the devil and his an-

gels. This effected the destruction of his flesh; he was brought to genuine repentance, restored to the fellowship of the church; and, persevering to the end, his spirit would be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

The same apostle, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20. speaks of some who had made shipwreck of the faith and of a good conscience; they had abandoned some important truth, and embraced some fatal error. This, in the view of the Apostle and the church, so far as regarded Christian-fellowship, was as bad as gross immorality. The Apostle, therefore, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, delivered such persons to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme. Though not favoured with the personal presence of the Apostle, any church, by authority of his writings, is warranted to do the same thing; that is, to excommunicate blasphemers and persons who deny the faith of the gospel. But this is not to punish them. Every society has a right to see that its members be agreed about the fundamental principles of their association. If there be any who reject such fundamental principles they have no right to be in it; and putting them away is doing them no wrong. It is, indeed, doing them a favour; for, if error and blasphemy be ruinous to their souls, the measure of putting them away, as unworthy of Christian fellowship, is calculated to impress them with a sense of their sin and danger, and by this means to save their souls.

Now, there is reason to expect that the laws of Christ, faithfully administered for the correction of immorality or error, will produce the effect intended by them; for he has promised to be with his people always to the end of the world; to give efficacy to his word, and bless the administration of his laws. The design of Christ, by all that is done in the church in his name, is to promote the salvation of lost sinners:—By the preaching of the gospel, to turn them from the power of Satan unto God; and, by the same means, together with the discipline of his church, to recover those who, after professing the faith, have fallen into sin. It is this that makes the whole a process of mercy; and which manifests the discipline of the church to be a privilege rather than a punishment.

This reasoning might be corroborated by the history of every church in which discipline has been faithfully administered. I shall mention only one fact, which is of recent occurrence, which has been certified to me by the reverend Gentleman under whose administration it happened; and which shows the good effects which result from an honest adherence to the divine rule of letting a sinner know explicitly the condition in which sin places him, with regard to the church; and that he cannot enjoy her fellowship without repentance.

A woman who had once and again been guilty of a sin which incurred the censure of the church, in the way of public rebuke, presented herself before the parish session, that she might be taken under discipline, expecting as a thing of course, that she would have to stand in the church, and that then she would be restored to church privileges. But appearing to the minister and elders to be a person who had no just sense of the evil of her sin, and exhibiting no signs of repentance, she was told that she could not be admitted to the privilege of the discipline and censure, which could be properly applied only to the penitent, and could be of no use to the hardened and insensible, such as she appeared to be. She went away greatly disappointed, because she was not to be rebuked as she expected. She was in effect, though not in form, excommunicated.

But the matter did not rest here. The sinner could find no peace in her own conscience. The idea haunted her by night and by day. She began to reflect on her own character and conduct. She thought she must be a wicked creature indeed, seeing she was not reckoned worthy, so much as to give public satisfaction for her sin. She was, in short, brought to serious consideration, and deep repentance: on evidence of which, she was restored to church communion; and she maintained a good character all the rest of her life. When she applied to the session, she was very ignorant, and could not read, but when awakened to a sense of her guilt, she immediately learned to read, so as to be able to peruse her Bible, and made it appear that she had profited by the merciful discipline of the church.

The contrast which I have been endeavouring to draw, may be expressed in one sentence,—the design and tendency of Christianity is not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; the design and tendency of Popery is not to save men's lives, but to destroy them.

When I speak of the *design* of Popery, I must be understood as looking beyond human agents; for I am taught by the word of God, that this system originated with the enemy of all righteousness; and I have no doubt his design by it was to oppose the benign influence of the gospel; and, by presenting to the world a counterfeit, instead of real Christianity, to prevent the salvation, and actually to destroy and ruin the souls of men. The apostle Paul gives a lively description of the system, 2 Thess. ii. 3—12, and tells us that its "coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." As for Papists themselves, I cannot allow myself to doubt that they believe their religion to be the only true one, and the only safe one; and I believe they are not aware of the design of

its author. We are told by the Apostle, in the passage above referred to, that when men did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie. What was foretold of this system has been awfully verified. It was from not liking the simple truth of the gospel, that many who professed to receive it, began to corrupt it by human inventions. They were, in righteous judgment, abandoned to believe their own errors. Thence arose that monstrous fabric of superstition, and spiritual domination, which has oppressed Europe for many hundred years.

It was the design of the Author of Christianity to save men's lives, that is, to save their souls; the Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost. But it was the design of the author of Popery to ruin the souls of men by a system of error and delusion; and he has carried his plan into effect, by enticing men to become the dupes, and the agents, and then the victims of that delusion.

That the tendency of Popery corresponds with its design, is evident by its whole history, and by the principles which it inculcates. We learn from the word of God, that there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending solely and entirely upon the finished work of Jesus Christ, but Popery rejects this as the sole ground of dependence, and directs its deluded adherents to depend less or more upon their own merit, and the merits of some whom they call saints; who are, however, mere creatures like themselves, and many of them of very doubtful character. This part of the system does not make such a figure in history as the wars and bloody persecutions which Popery has excited, because from the very nature of the thing, it is not capable of being made the subject of history. It is the subject of individual experience in that most important hour, to every man, when he must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ: and if it be true, as it most certainly is, that only he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned; then that system of religion which flatters men with the idea of being saved by some other way than believing on Christ, stands chargeable with this unavoidable consequence,—it tends not to save men's souls but to destroy them. With regard to the destruction of men's bodies, we know from history that Popery has slain its thousands and ten thousands; but with regard to the ruin of souls, from this fatal error, no man can tell the millions who have been by Popery deceived to their everlasting destruction.

I am aware that I am here treading on delicate ground, and that many who take themselves for Protestants, will accuse me of

uncharitableness, but I care not while I know that I am upon *sure* ground, as I consider myself to be, while I proceed upon the plain declarations of the word of God. There is no name under heaven, given among men, by which a sinner can be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, and there is no way of being saved, even by him, but in the divinely appointed way of believing on him. Popery holds out another way, namely, that of believing in the Church,—receiving implicitly the dogmas of fallible men; praying to, and trusting in saints and angels; and doing whatever the Church prescribes. Now, without pretending to ascertain the condition of individuals of ancient or modern times, I am guilty of no uncharitableness, and no presumption, when I say, that this is the direct road to everlasting perdition, and that he who travels in it to the end must perish, and that for ever.

I shall, however, be better understood by some of my readers, and I shall perhaps make a deeper impression on their minds, by returning to the tendency of Popery, with regard to the bodies and the property of men. Here, most evidently, its tendency is not to save but to destroy. I have partly proved this already, by showing its insidious and incessant interference with the affairs of kings and kingdoms, and exciting war and persecution. I shall now give some instances of a more private nature, but which are well calculated to show the spirit of the system, and its tendency to destroy men's lives, as well as to rob them of their property.

The Popish sentence of excommunication was used as an instrument of oppression and destruction against private and obscure individuals, as well as against princes; and this use of it continues to the present day. The following is the form of "excommunication pronounced by Philip Dunn, a Popish bishop in Ireland, against Francis Freeman, who embraced the Protestant religion in 1765;—found among the bishop's papers, in his house in the county of Wicklow:

"By the authority of God the Father Almighty, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, and St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the holy saints, we excommunicate Francis Freeman, late of the county of Dublin, but now of Tuck-mill, in the county of Wicklow, that, in spite of God and St. Peter, and in spite of all the holy saints, and in spite of our most holy father the Pope, (God's vicar on earth), and in spite of our right reverend father in God, Philip Dunn, our diocesan, and worshipful canons, who serve God daily, hath apostatized to a most damnable religion, full of heresy and blasphemy; excommunicated let him be, and delivered over to the devil, as a perpetual malefactor, and schismatic; accursed let him be, in all cities, and in all towns, in fields, in ways, in yards, in houses, and in all other

places, whither lying or rising, walking or running, leaning or standing, waking or sleeping, eating or drinking, or whatsoever thing he does; besides, we separate him from the threshold and all good prayers of the church; from the participation of the holy Jesus; from all sacraments, chapels, and altars; from the holy bread, and holy water; from all the merit of God's holy priests and religious men, and from their cloysters, and all pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities, which all the holy Popes have granted them; and we give him over utterly to the fiend; and let him quench his soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire, as this candle is quenched and put out. And let us pray to God, our Lady, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, that all the senses of his body may fail, as now the light of this candle is gone; except he come, on sight hereof, and openly confess his damnable heresy and blasphemy, and, by repentance, make amends, as much as in him lies, to God, our Lady, St. Peter, and the worshipful company of this church; and as the staff of this holy cross now falls down, so may he, except he recants and repents. Signed, Philip Dunn." *Free Thoughts*, p. 422.

This is in the true spirit of Popery. Here there is nothing of mercy; of course, nothing like the discipline of the church of Christ. All is vengeance, fire, and fury, against the man, whose only crime is, that he has presumed to think for himself on the subject of religion, and become a Protestant. When a member of the church of Christ falls into sin or error, and if it is even necessary to excommunicate him, he has still the benefit of the church's prayers for his recovery; but, in the Church of Rome, the excommunicated person is declared to be separated from all good prayers of the Church; and, with a fiendlike malice, he is utterly given over to the fiend, that he may quench his soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire. Among a superstitious people, such a sentence must unavoidably affect the property and even the life of the person subjected to it, so that the tendency of Popish excommunication is to destroy men's lives.

This will appear farther from the following fact of still more recent occurrence;—It was a case tried, a few years ago, before the Hon. Mr. Justice Day, and a special Jury, at the Cork Assizes. "A baker of the name of Donovan brought an action against the Rev. Mr. O'Brien, vicar general to Dr. Coppinger, titular Bishop of Cork, and Roman Catholic parish priest of Clonakilty. The damages were laid at L.500. It appeared on the trial, that a subscription had been set on foot by the priest, for the purpose of building a Roman Catholic Chapel. Donovan was ordered to pay, as his affixed quota, the sum of 16s. 3d., which he accordingly did. He was afterwards called upon to pay 9s., this sum he likewise paid: but observed, that he was very

poor, and that he could not afford it. A third demand was made of him, by the priest, of 16s., which Donovan refused to comply with. On Donovan's going to mass, the following Sunday, he was asked by the priest, whether he would pay the 16s. or not? He answered, that he was not able. The priest rejoined, 'I will settle you.' Terrified at this observation, Donovan sent, by his wife, 16s. to the house of the priest, who refused then to take less than two guineas. On the following Sunday, the priest cursed from the altar all those who had not paid their demands towards building the Chapel. Donovan went, on next holiday, to mass, and was formally excommunicated, and the people denounced as cursed and contaminated, if they should deal or hold any communication with him. This threat was so effectual, that no one of the country people would sell a sod of turf to Donovan to heat his oven; and he could not even sell, in his own name, such flour or stock as lay on his hands. Reduced almost to despair, the baker went, in a white sheet, to the Chapel, as a voluntary penance, and asked pardon of God and the priest for his disobedience; and was there, by the priest, desired to attend him to his house, where he again demanded from him the two guineas, which Donovan assured him he could not possibly make up. The excommunication was, therefore, continued in full force against him, and he was consequently obliged to shut up his house. The above facts were incontrovertibly proved by two unwilling witnesses. The Jury, after a very able charge from the learned Judge, found a verdict for the plaintiff of £.50 damages."

Many of my readers will recollect having read the above in the public Papers about four years ago; and I believe it is as authentic as any reported law case which we find in the Newspapers. It shows the cruel and vengeful spirit of the Popish religion, which grinds the faces of the poor, and would wring the very blood from their veins. It shows also in what way the spiritual authority of the priests is used for the destruction of men's lives, or, which tends to the same thing, depriving them of their means of subsistence.

Candour, however, requires me to say, that the Editor of the Orthodox Journal endeavours to palliate, and almost to deny the fact, though it must have been proved in open Court. He says "I was well convinced that the *whole* of the account was a complete tissue of falsehood, except the fact that such a case was tried." I believe he knows also the other fact, that the priest was convicted, by a verdict of a Jury, and ordained to pay £.50, in name of damages. He gives a long letter from Mr O'Brien, addressed to the Editor of the TIMES, and complains grievously of the partiality of that Gentleman, for declining to publish it in his paper; though it would certainly be hard upon Editors, if

they were obliged to print all that convicted persons might please to write against the juries who convicted them.

But, from the priest's own showing, I am convinced that the facts were proved against him. He admits that money was levied of the people to build his Chapel; the better sort were expected to pay a guinea; the second three crowns, which is 16s. 3d. Irish; and the third class, half-a-guinea: from the poor, he says, nothing was expected. He maintains, indeed, that the payment was voluntary; but I know the same thing is pleaded on behalf of the priest in Glasgow, while I can prove that, in some cases at least, it was so much otherwise, that he made application to masters to retain in their own hands, for the use of his Chapel, part of the wages of servants, which he thought they would not pay voluntarily. O'Brien admits, that, after the Chapel was erected, considerable debts remained to be liquidated; that he had threatened with an ecclesiastical censure, those who did not pay their quota: that "Donovan was the only one who contumaciously resisted the regulations of the subscribers, and the authority of his pastor. The congregation witnessed his audacity, and resented it, by withdrawing themselves, in some measure, from his communion." He rests his defence partly on the bad character of one of the witnesses, who, he says, was suborned to swear that he had excommunicated the baker, and every one that should deal with him; but there was another witness against whom he states no objection. In short, his whole letter is a piece of downright Popish shuffling, and can have no weight with any impartial man, in opposition to the verdict of a jury. He says, the deluded woman, on whose testimony this decision was founded, died soon after, a deplorable victim of remorse and despair; but he knows that the decision was not founded on her testimony alone; and he does not deny the fact, that the poor man was utterly ruined in his business, by means of an ecclesiastical censure, threatened or inflicted by him. Now, this was the only fact with which the jury had to do,—a fact which was clearly proved, and which, notwithstanding all his quibbling, the priest does not deny.

I should not have troubled my readers with this defence which the priest makes for himself, had I not thought it but fair, since I was giving the story, to give also the fact that a vindication had been attempted. Besides, the style and manner of this defence afford another evidence that there can be no dependence upon a Popish representation of any fact, not even with regard to what takes place in our own times, much less with regard to any fact of ancient history. The above trial is stated, by the priest, to have taken place as far back as 1805; and, for any thing I know, this part of his statement is true.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19th, 1818.

I AM afraid that AMICUS VERITATIS will think that I have lost sight of him altogether; and perhaps he will think that I consider the remaining parts of his letters unanswerable, seeing I have taken so little notice of them in my three last Numbers. He may keep himself easy on that score. I have no intention of slurring over any part of the controversy; and I shall pay all due respect to the subjects which he has brought into view in my own time, and in my own way.

His charge against the Church of Scotland on the matter of indulgences, has led me to digress farther than I at first intended, on the subject of church discipline in general, and excommunication in particular. In the course of this digression, I stated some strong facts with regard to excommunication in Ireland, even in the present day, and as I have fallen upon some more matter relative to clerical management, and the oppression of our fellow subjects in the sister Island, I shall lay it before my readers before I proceed to any thing else.

The Reverend Charles Bourke, a Romish priest in Ireland, has lately published a pamphlet, entitled, "Popish Episcopal Tyranny exposed," which makes such an exposure as I did not expect to see in the present day. Mr. Bourke, it seems, had somehow fallen under the displeasure of his Bishop, the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron of Killala; and his *Lordship*, without rhyme

or reason, so far as appears, proceeded to deprive, depose, and excommunicate the unhappy priest, notwithstanding the following strong testimonies on his behalf.

Copy of a memorial that accompanied a letter from Mr. Bourke to his LORDSHIP, dated May 12th, 1815. "To the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron. The memorial of the clergy of this diocese of Killala, humbly exposes to your Lordship, that we, the under mentioned parish priests and dignitaries of this diocese, do express our sorrowful feelings for the Rev. Charles Bourke being deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the diocese, and from the exercise of any ecclesiastical function, by your *Lordship*. These sorrowful sentiments press the harder on us, as we know him to be a good priest; and a virtuous, amiable, moral, learned one. We hope from your Lordship's goodness, that you will be pleased to revoke the verbal sentence of suspension you passed on him; or at least give him leave to say mass; or, in fine, his *exeat* for some other diocese. The different flocks, or parishes, that he attended, speak highly in his behalf; and the gentlemen of the country, the most respectable, give him a fair character.

(Signed)

JAMES HARAN, <i>Castleconor,</i>	THOMAS MAGEE, <i>Ardagh,</i>
DAN. M'NAMARA, <i>Easky,</i>	PAT. FLANEGAN, <i>Kilbride,</i>
JOHN BURNE, <i>Templeboy,</i>	THOMAS MONELLY, <i>Dunfeeny,</i>
JOHN KELLY, <i>Drumard,</i>	JAMES KILBOY, <i>Muigawnagh,</i>
WILLIAM KELLY, <i>Screen,</i>	JOHN MAGEE, <i>Lackin."</i>

"Copy of a Memorial of the Parishioners of the Parish of Kilbelfad, to the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron.

"We, the under-mentioned Parishioners of the Parish of Kilbelfad, unanimously complained of the want of the administration of the sacraments, neglect of duty, oppression and extortion of the Rev. Francis Mangan; who, after many applications, permitted several to die without the extreme unction, and others without baptism. It was a common practice with him, to charge, even the poorest person, the price of a bottle of wine, when he called on duty. He kept a chaplain, who charged tenpence to each family; and, after he collected his oats himself, the chaplain made a second collection. This done, he used to discharge the chaplain, and bring in a third to make his collection also. There was no use in expostulations: his WHIP was the only law for our conduct; and God only knows how we felt his severity! We made repeated complaints to Doctor Bellew, and latterly to the Rev. James Haran, who sent us the Rev. Charles Bourke, the only clergyman who gave us any spiritual consolation these fifteen years back.—We hope, in your Lordship's goodness, that you will keep Mr. Mangan from us; and that your Lordship will

continue Mr. Bourke to us, for he is an exemplary good priest, who feeds his flock in the sweetest pastures. And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray," &c. p. 8.

Here, with great simplicity, we are told in what manner some priests rule over, and oppress the poor people in Ireland. Let it be remembered, this is the testimony of the parishioners, in a memorial to their Bishop. I suppose they did not expect it was to appear in print; and that it was destined to grace the pages of "THE PROTESTANT." Had they thought of this, perhaps the fear of the Rev. Mr. Mangan's WHIP would have deterred them from speaking so plainly.

It seems his "*illustrious*" Lordship did not like to have so good a priest within his jurisdiction. He accuses him of several immoralities, particularly of drunkenness, but he does not trouble himself with evidence; and Mr. Bourke seems very triumphantly to repel the charge; and he more than insinuates, that the Bishop's dislike to him, arose from his not being a man who could be content with things as they are; and wink at gross negligence and immorality on the part of his clerical brethren. He appealed to the Pope against the sentence of his diocesan; and there, I suppose, the appeal lies to this day, for he is too poor to go to Rome to prosecute his cause; and the Bishop has refused to answer the appeal, or give the reasons of his conduct, till he receive an extract from Rome.

Bourke very feelingly describes the effect of the excommunication upon himself. His ghostly father, that is, the Bishop, meant, he says, "to kill his son, both temporally and spiritually; temporally, as far as he has endeavoured to starve him to death by means of a major excommunication; and this excommunication was to be read in all the chapels of the diocese, by each priest to his respective flock;—that no means of support, consolation, or sustenance should be left him, but to die like a dog in a ditch, if the priest or man, on whom the attack was made, should be so weak as to become the dupe of such ill-timed fulminations.

"By a major excommunication, one is deprived of all the goods of the church, and even of Christian burial, of assisting at mass, or divine service, or office of any kind, at the prayers of the church!! It deprives a man of receiving the sacraments, of the functions of holy orders, of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of all the suffrages of the church; in such manner that those who have incurred the censure, have no part in the affairs of the church, unless they may have a legitimate excuse. For a greater clearing of this matter, I will reduce to five classes, the goods of which a man is deprived by a major excommunication. They are contained in this verse:

Os, orare, vale, communio, mensa negatur.

“ The word *Os*, signifies that the faithful should not speak to an excommunicated person. *Orare*, that they should not pray in his company. *Vale*, that they should not bid him the time of day, nor show him any mark of civility or respect. *Communio*, shews that they should not live in the same house, nor under the same roof, negotiate, work, nor have any intercourse with him. *Mensa negatur*, signifies, that the faithful should not eat, or drink, or sleep, with an excommunicated person. When denounced, all the faithful are forbidden, under pain of a minor excommunication, to commune, in any respect, with an excommunicated person; but before this denunciation, the faithful may commune with them, and give them what is not forbidden in the divine, or natural law.

“ By the above we see, that, after the denunciation, the faithful are obliged to avoid the excommunicated person, under pain of incurring a minor excommunication; which, even they do not incur, if any of the five following reasons may be alleged to excuse them:

“ *Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, necesse.*”

Mr. Bourke illustrates these five reasons at length. The substance of them is;—that a person, by intercourse with one excommunicated, does not incur minor excommunication, if he can plead manifest utility; the marriage relation; the connexion of children, or domestics; ignorance of the case; or urgent necessity.

“ Though the above motives,” says he, “ excuse the excommunicated person as well as the faithful, from a major excommunication, or from incurring a minor excommunication; yet few there are who know it, except those who have had a long course of theological studies. Besides, the clergy never explain to their flocks the reasons that excuse from a major excommunication; it is not their interest to do it. They only instil into them, that by an excommunication they are on the brink of destruction, and just ready to fall into the fiery furnace of hell!! This they do to keep them in awe, and to spread the veil of ignorance over their eyes, in order that they may be subject to themselves; and to themselves *alone*, upon all occasions!!!

“ Many, besides, of the clergy never had a regular course of studies, and therefore are insufficient to instruct, or do away the cloud of ignorance that hangs over the poor. In this manner, the poor, (God help them,) are kept in the dark; and this is

the interest of their clergy, who tyrannize over them more than the Indian chiefs do over the savages who inhabit the most uncultivated regions of the earth. It is but too well known that it is the want of preaching the gospel, and inculcating its evangelical principles, in imitation of the maxims taught by Christ, by example and word, that make Roman Catholics so stupid and lukewarm in their duty to God and their neighbour: and when they see their instructors give a bad example themselves, in the violation of the principles that bind and link society together, what wonder that they, the lower orders, should be led out of the path, and commit the excesses we see daily by woeful experience, which too frequently bring them to condign punishment? And all this, owing to their clergy keeping them in ignorance, with the oppression, extortion, and the tyranny of their curses and excommunications; which are always ready, even on the most insignificant and trivial occasions." *p.* 38.

Let it be remembered that this account of the character and conduct of the Popish priests in Ireland is given by one of themselves, and one who knows them well. The following shows how much some of the Papists in Ireland are opposed to the instruction of the people; and with what a jealous eye they regard the operation of the Hibernian Society, whose object it is to teach the Irish to read:—

"His Lordship, (Bishop Waldron,) in opposition to the London Hibernian Society, said, he would establish Catholic Schools in the two parishes, and appoint schoolmasters for that purpose, with salaries of twenty pounds per annum. Full of this expectation, John Tympany (who had a wife and a houseful of very helpless children, and was in possession of twenty guineas a-year by teaching one of the charity schools established for the benefit of the poor,) was deprived of the means of supporting his wife and helpless family. Relying on the veracity of his Lordship's word of honour, he was drawn from his allegiance to the society, and lost a year's salary of twenty guineas. This poor man now has no alternative but that of going to beg! It is true the Bishop gave him a black suit of clothes; and so transformed him from *Shane-bane* to *Shane-dough*. The poor man was known by the name of *Shane-bane* which signifies White John. *Shane-dough*, is Black John, into which he was transformed by wearing the Bishop's black suit of second-hand clothes; which stands the poor man in twenty guineas, but reduces him to the extremity of going to beg! He is indeed an honest, well-meaning man, who knows the Irish language well, and whose instructions to the Irish youth would be of great utility. I have seen very few who know the Irish better." *p.* 42.

This man, it seems, was seduced by the Bishop, under false promises, to give up the service of the Hibernian Society; and

was reduced to poverty, because it was the desire of his Lordship that his people should not learn to read their own language. The following gives a farther development of the manner in which religious matters are at this day conducted by the Romish clergy in Ireland :—

“ Dr. Waldron, on his arrival to his diocese of Killala, to prove his firmness in discharge of his apostolic mission, assembled all his clergy, and preached the necessity of holding fast the principles of the most ancient religion from the time of Christ and his Apostles, down to the present epoch ; that, to hold fast to it, and not be turned about with every wind of doctrine, it would be necessary to begin and fix the Bishop on a permanent footing : that this could only be done by paying in to him all the money collected by all and each of his Clergy, since the decease of the Right Rev. Dr. Bellew, to his commencement of assuming the reins of his Episcopal government. By giving him this money, extorted from the poor without pity or remorse, to be employed in defraying the exorbitant expenses, indispensibly (he said) annexed to the bringing the Archbishop of Dublin to Tuam, in order to impose hands on Dr. Waldron, and also to defray that of assembling troops to keep peace in Tuam during the august ceremony of consecration, the gift would become laudable ! it would be a most pious work of charity to dignify the Episcopal character, by the oppression of many, and the extortion from several who had not perhaps salt to eat with their potatoes . That no one may be at a loss to know, where this extortion lies,—it is the Bishop’s exacting half-a-guinea, instead of half-a-crown, for the dispensation of banns,—making, at a very moderate average, of this merchantable commodity, from five to six hundred pounds a-year, by allowing from twenty to forty marriages in each parish. Formerly, the dispensation of banns was but half-a-crown : now it is a half-guinea ; having no right, authority, or law, for this augmentation. Baptism is raised from an English shilling to an English half-crown : legacy, on every corpse, from an English crown to ten shillings ; which, if the priest does not get immediately, he will take away the pot, the wheel, or the blanket. I have known a certain priest, where the above furniture was wanting, to take the hens from the roost ! This legacy they must get, (though they were sure the miserable individual who survives, had not a bit to put in his mouth that night,) or some article proportionable in value. The distribution of the holy oils is raised. The priests are allowed to get, and force, a large measure of oats annually from the poorest creature in the parish ; the poorest widow not excepted ! This collection the priest is allowed to make, provided that, of the collected oats, he sends a sack to the Bishop annually.” *pp.* 42, 43.

“ At Christmas and Easter, it is the rule with every parish

priest, on Sunday, to publish his weekly stations through the villages; on Monday, for example, at such a man's house, all the villagers are to attend, men, women, married, and unmarried. Should, however, any one absent himself, this day, for the want of money, or any other cause, however legitimate, the priest sends the vestments to his house, the following day, as a punishment upon the miserable man. The poor individual is then obliged, should he pawn his blanket, to prepare a dinner for the priest,—with tea and sugar, bread, beef, mutton, fowl, hay, and oats, and plenty of whisky; although it may be for the want of a shilling to pay the priest's dues that the unfortunate wretch absented himself the day before, which he could not pay at the periodical season of the priest's dues!!!

“ On Tuesday, the same at some other man's house, in some other village; and so on, until all the confessions are heard in all the parishes of this diocese. Easter comes on, and the same line of conduct is observed by the priest as at Christmas.

“ At a moderate average, one or two guineas in bread, tea and sugar, beef, mutton, fowl, and whisky, hay, and oats, will not defray the expense of the priest, who has a right to invite all his friends to the feast! Any one who wishes to be exempt from these heavy charges, must be on the alert, and very cautious to send butter, eggs, chickens; in a word, he must ingratiate himself well by means of these little perquisites into the priest's favour, a little before the return of these periodical seasons of Christmas and Easter.

“ Now, before these confessions begin, the priest tells them it is intended to do penance for their sins, which is best done by fasting and prayer; but which is quite opposite to the grand feast that the priest not only expects, but must necessarily have, though he was sure the miserable creature should go and beg the next day. I leave the world to judge what kind of penance this is! Some priests will not drink whisky: they must have rum, brandy, or wine, by which they get basely drunk, before they leave the poor man's house; and, in return for his civilities, they insult him with the most gross and ignominious language.

“ The good usage which the priest has got, and the extravagant expenses which he has occasioned, are no protection to the poor man against abuse and insult. I have known a priest, (Mr M.—at Backs) to charge the man of the house for a bottle of wine, when he did not, on these occasions, get it to drink, though the man had a bottle of rum for him. In Templeboy parish, through vengeance and an old grudge, a certain priest, Mr. B——, went to a poor widow's house to hear confessions. This poor widow had but a small cock of hay for the use of a little heifer. The hay she sold to be able to procure a dinner for the priest. Her means did not allow her to buy any whisky. The priest told

her, she owed him half-a-crown for confessions. This half-crown she retained off the price of the hay, to pay the priest. Accordingly, when dinner was served up, she said to the priest, I have no spirits for you, nor any means to get it but this half crown you say I owe you, and which I retained off the price of my little cock of hay; will you take it in lieu of the debt, or shall I send it for spirits? The priest took the half-crown, put it in his pocket, drank water at that dinner, and replied, he might soon have a call to some other place where he would get enough to drink.

“I could make up a volume, were I to recapitulate all the abuses of this nature I know; but, for brevity’s sake, I omit them for the present. Every head of a family must pay an English shilling at Christmas and Easter, and every woman a hank of yarn: the unmarried sixpence halfpenny. No exceptions of widows, orphans, servants, male or female; and, if any remittance is made, it is to the rich. It is made to those who are not real objects of charity. Innumerable are the examples of extortions that I could detail.” *pp.* 44, 45.

Mr. Bourke proceeds to state some shameful abuses in the manner of hearing confession, which the priests, in that diocese, are in the habit of hearing in private rooms, instead of doing so in the church as the law requires. He says, indeed, in his preface, “that the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this day, in Ireland, as well as on the Continent, are not much more correct than those of the clergy at the time of the Reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth, which cannot be denied.” When the Editor of the Orthodox Journal spoke of spotless purity of the character of the Irish priests, (See No. XV. page 120.) I suspected there was something wrong; but I did not know they were so bad as is here represented by one of themselves:—

“The mistresses and children of Rev. Gentlemen can be shown, whenever they may choose to put it to the trial. Many inducements occur to me, to mention their names, but I restrain myself for a more seasonable opportunity. They themselves know that I can prove this assertion incontestibly.” *p.* 45. “They have the care of souls, and, like the blind leading the blind, they will both inevitably fall into the ditch. These are they of whom I can enumerate eleven (nearly one half of the number in the diocese.) who, with uncontrollable dominion, tyrannize over the imbecility and weakness of their poor adherents; and whom the Bishop is said to hold in great esteem, and high honour for his own private views. Is not this the strongest reason, motive, and incentive, to make them, with so much obstinacy, resist the *veto*, for fear that, in any respect whatever, their clerical dominion should suffer the smallest diminution.” *p.* 46.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXIV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 26th, 1818.

I RETURN now to the Letter of AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes as follows: (See Part I. p. 19.) "But, Sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the doctrine of the Catholic Church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection, that Catholics abjure, as antichristian, those principles imputed to them by your Correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the Pope is infallible. That I may be found correct, I shall refer to Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. This is a document which is approved by the Pope and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received and accredited by the British government, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand; and now again boldly repeat, 'that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or a Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.' With what a face of effrontery can your Correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them."

One should imagine, from the above strong assertions, that the statute referred to contained a very ample exposition of the Romish faith, "especially with regard to the liberty of committing sin," and the infallibility of the Pope; that the principles of the Romish Church were fixed by an act of the British Legislature;

and that "*never*" any thing was a doctrine of the Church of Rome but what is contained in the Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. Now, it will perhaps surprise some of my readers to be informed of the simple truth, with regard to this matter:—the Act does not contain a word about indulgence to commit sin, or the infallibility of the Pope; and as little does it declare, concerning any point whatever, that it *never* was a "doctrine of the Catholic Church." In short, as an answer to what I had written on the subject of indulgences, and the Pope's infallibility, AMICUS VERITATIS might as well have referred to the Alcoran of Mahomet.

If I had accused my Popish neighbours of disloyalty to King George III. or of maintaining that faith is not to be kept with heretics; or that they believed the Pope could release *them* from their oaths of allegiance; then, so far as an Act of Parliament, and their own solemn oaths, could refute such accusations, they should have been refuted. But these were not the subjects of which I had been treating, and which AMICUS VERITATIS was professing to answer. I did, indeed, say (Part I. p. 7.) "that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin." I say so still; and the Act of Parliament says nothing to the contrary. I said further, in the same sentence,—"*he* professed to relieve individuals and whole nations from the obligation of an oath," and I say so still; notwithstanding the Act of Parliament, which does not say a word about what the Pope professed to do, but merely ordains that Papists in this country, who wish the benefit of that Act, must swear that they do not allow the Pope to have such power over them. In short, the Act prescribes an oath of allegiance, expressed in very strong language; but, instead of defining the principles of the Romish Church, it expressly repeals an Act of King William, in which the leading principles of Popery were expressed, and Papists, under certain pains, were required upon oath to renounce them. With regard to the matter of not keeping faith with heretics, though Papists in this country choose to disavow it on their solemn oaths, there is perhaps no peculiar doctrine of the Romish Church which rests upon higher authority, as I hope to show in my next Number; and those who disavow this doctrine, and yet adhere to the Church of Rome, only contradict themselves.

I intend, in this Number, to give the form of the oath which Papists are now by law required to take; but, for the information of such of my readers as have not access to many books on the subject, I shall give the forms which were prescribed by law, in former times. The following is "The oath of allegiance appointed by King James I. of England." It is said to have been

drawn up with great care by the king himself; and it seems to have furnished a model for all that have followed. "It was, (says the Author of *Free Thoughts*, p. 234,) such a favourite measure of his, that he laboured mightily, with his royal pen, to promote its success; thinking the Gordian knot so fast tied, that no wit of man could loose it, and that if Roman Catholics could be once caught herein, they must be for ever tied firmly to his throne."

"I, A. B. do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our Sovereigne Lord King James is lawful and rightful King in this realme, and of all other his Majesty's dominions, and countreyes, and that the Pope, neither of himself, or by any authority by the Church and See of Rome, or by any other meanes, with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose of any of his Majesty's dominions or kingdoms, or to authorize any foreigne prince to invade or annoy him or his countreyes, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty, or to give license, or leave, to any of them to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty's royal person, state, or government, or to any of his Majesty's subjects within his Majesty's dominions.

"Also I do swear from my heart, that, notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted, by the Pope or his successors, or by any authority derived, or pretended to be derived, from him or his See, against the said King, his aires or successors, or any absolution of the saids subjects from their obedience; I will bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty, his aires and successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his, or their persones, their crowne and dignity, be reason, or colour of any such sentence, and declaration, or otherwise; and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his aires and successors, all treasons, or traitours, or conspiracies, which I shall know or hear of, to be against him or any of them. And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhorre, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable position and doctrine, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do believe, and in conscience am resolved, that neither the Pope, nor any person whatsoever, hath power to absolve me of this oath, or any part thereof, which I acknowledge, by good and lawful authority, to be lawfully ministered to me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. And all these things

I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God."

The latter part of this oath is founded upon the well known casuistry of Papists, countenanced by some of their high doctrinal authorities, that it was lawful to say one thing and think another, even when upon oath, if it was to serve any important purpose; * and the whole shews the great jealousy with which Papists were regarded. It did not, however, serve the purpose intended by it. "How egregiously was the king deceived, not considering the persons and the religion he had to do with? His boasted *Kingcraft* was overmatched and outwitted by Jesuitical priestcraft. If they had not art enough to untie the knot, they had a spiritual sword ready to cut it. Accordingly, they derided his folly (and not altogether unjustly) for imagining that the consciences of Catholics were to be bound with such ropes of straw, or caught and held by such cobwebs. Let us hear the words of Paschenius, who, as well as Bellarmine, wrote against the king, and in condemnation of the oath; and they are words which deserve the particular attention of our present legislators:—'*Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta sit simplicitas!* &c. See, in so great craft, what great simplicity doth bewray itself. When he had placed all his security in that oath, he thought he had found such a manner of oath, knit with so many circumstances, that it could not, with safety of conscience, by any means, be dissolved by any man. But he could not see, that, if the Pope did dissolve that oath, all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the king, or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. Yea, I will say another thing which is more admirable. You know, I suppose, that an unjust oath, if it be evidently known, or openly declared to be such, bindeth no man, but is *ipso facto* null. That the king's oath is unjust, hath been sufficiently declared by the Pastor of the Church himself (i. e. the Pope). You see, therefore, that the obligation of it is vanished

* "One may swear that he has not done a thing, although in fact he may have done it, by understanding, in his own mind, that he did not do it on a certain day, or before he was born, or any similar circumstance, without the words which he uses having any sense that would let it be known. And this is very convenient in many situations, and is always *very just*, when it is necessary, or useful for health, honour, or property." *Sanchez, Op. Mor.* as quoted from Pascal's Provincial Letters by Mr Carlisle of Dublin.

into smoke : so that the bond, which by so many wise men, was thought to be of iron, is become less than straw." *Free Thoughts*, p. 234. The author refers to B. P. Epist. J. R. Bishop Usher's Sermon before the Commons, 1620.

So, it seems, if the Pope should declare an oath which has been taken by a Papist to a Protestant Sovereign, to be unlawful, it is *ipso facto* null, and of no obligation. Such is the doctrine of a grave Popish writer; so far as appears it was the popular doctrine of the day; and the Pope acted upon it when he relieved subjects from their oaths of allegiance.

The following is the oath imposed by the Act of King William, which is more severe than that of King James, as it implies an express renunciation of many of the doctrinal tenets of the Church of Rome.

"The formula, or oath of purgation, appointed by the Act of King William to be taken by Papists in Scotland.

"I, A. B. do sincerely from my heart profess, and declare before God, who searcheth the heart, That I do deny, disown, and abhorre these tenets and doctrines of the Papal Romish Church, viz. the supremacy of the Pope and Bishops of Rome over all Pastors of the Catholic Church; His power and authority over Kings, Princes, and States; The infallibility that he pretends to, either without, or with a general council; His power of dispensing and pardoning; The doctrine of transubstantiation, and the corporeal presence, with the communion without the cup in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; The adoration and sacrifice professed and practised by the Popish Church in the mass; The invocation of angels and saints; The worshipping of images, crosses, and relicks; The doctrine of supererogation, indulgences, and purgatory; and the service and worship in an unknown tongue: All which tenets and doctrines of the said Church, I believe to be contrary to, and inconsistent with the written word of God. And I do from my heart deny, disown, and disclaim the said doctrines and tenets of the Church of Rome, as in the presence of God, without any equivocation, or mental reservation, but according to the plain meaning of the words as to me offered and proposed. So help me God." *Free Thoughts*, p. 388.

The above was required under an Act intituled, An Act to prevent the growth of Popery, which imposed certain penalties and disabilities on those who should refuse to make a solemn renunciation of Popery in the above terms. This Act is repealed by "An Act for requiring a certain form of oath or abjuration, from his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, 3d June, 1793."

In the preamble of this Act, it is declared that, "the foresaid formula, (that of King William,) contains only a renunciation of

speculative and dogmatical opinions, but imports no positive assurance of the submission and attachment of persons making the same to the laws and constitution of the realm, or to the person of his most sacred Majesty." It is then enacted, "that from henceforth, all persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, within that part of Great Britain called Scotland, who shall take and subscribe the oath, abjuration, and declaration hereinafter expressed, and in the manner hereby directed and required, shall be exempted and relieved from all the pains, penalties, and disabilities imposed, enacted, revived, ratified, and confirmed by the before mentioned Act of the eighth and ninth Session of the first Parliament of King William the Third, as fully and effectually, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as if such persons had actually made the renunciation of Popery thereby ordained, according to the formula thereunto subjoined.

"II. And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the Oath, Abjuration, and Declaration to be so taken and subscribed, shall be in the words following, (that is to say)

"I, A. B. do hereby declare, That I do profess the Roman Catholic Religion: I, A. B. do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his Majesty, King George the Third, and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose, and make known to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons, and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an Act, (intituled, An Act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subjects) is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person, claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms: And I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pretence of their being hereticks or infidels; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with hereticks or infidels: And I further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or any authority of the See of Rome, or by any other authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever: And I do promise, that I will

not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this Declaration: And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am, or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this Declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, and declare that it was null or void. SO HELP ME GOD."

"This document," according to AMICUS VERITATIS, "is approved by the Pope, and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received, and accredited by the British Government, as containing the principles of Catholics." It is certainly very natural that the British Government should receive and accredit one of its own statutes for all the purposes expressed by it; but the statute referred to, does not declare the principles of Catholics, as any one may see that reads it. It calls these principles "speculative and dogmatical opinions," with which it professes to have nothing to do, farther than to repeal an act, which made it a crime to hold such opinions. That it is approved by "the Pope, and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms," is a matter of very little importance,—it is the manner of such dignitaries, to approve of any thing that serves their present purpose. We know that the Pope approved of the usurpation of Bonaparte, so far as to crown him, and bless him as his dear son in the faith, because he could not help it. Neither can he help his adherents in Britain, or procure for them the privileges which they desire, without their taking the oath of allegiance, which the law requires; he therefore approves of their taking it. But as he has never by any public act that I know of, renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents, we have no security that he will not do what was often done by his predecessors, whenever he shall think proper; especially when he finds that it will promote the interest of the Holy See.

On this Act, AMICUS VERITATIS takes his stand; and he may stand there long enough before he will get the act to speak what he ascribes to it,—that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catho-

lic Church, that a Pope or a Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.

In addition to several documents which I have produced on this subject in former Numbers, I shall subjoin one which speaks plainly to the point. It is "AN INDULGENCE, granted by Pope Clement VI. to John and Joan, King and Queen of France, and to their successors for ever.

"Clement, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear son and daughter in Christ, the illustrious John and Joan, King and Queen of France, greeting, and our apostolic benediction. Your desires we willingly approve of, and especially those, wherein may God graciously give you that peace and repose of soul you piously seek after; hence it is, that we, ready to answer your humble request, do, by our apostolic authority, grant by these presents, an indulgence for ever hereafter, to you and your successors, that for the time being, shall be Kings and Queens of France; and to every of you and them: That such confessor, regular or secular, you and they shall choose, may *commute*, for such vows as you may have already made; or which by you or your successors may be hereafter made; (vows touching the holy land, the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of chastity and continence only excepted) and also such oaths by you taken, and by you and them to be taken, in all times coming, that you and they cannot *profitably keep*: By other works of piety, as to him shall seem expedient towards God, and for the peace of your and their souls. Be it, therefore, utterly unlawful to any upon earth, to annul this our grant, or by any act of temerity to controvert the same. And be it known to any one, that presumptuously attempts so to do, that he forthwith incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul. Given at Avignon, 12 Calend. Maii, ann. 1347." See Dacherius, *Spicileg. miscell. Epistolar*, Tom. 4. p. 275. quoted in *Protestant Catechism*, Glasgow, 1779.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXV.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 2d, 1819.

WITH what a face of effrontery," says AMICUS VERITATIS, "can your Correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men, who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue, and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them?" In my last Number, I gave the words of the solemn oath, or abjuration, which Papists in this country are required by law to make, from which my readers will see that they abjure none of the principles which I had imputed to them; that it is merely an oath of civil allegiance, an abjuration of any *claim of civil* authority which the Pope, or any foreign prince, may claim in this country, and a disavowal of one speculative, or rather practical principle of their church,—that faith is not to be kept with heretics. I had not, in any of the letters which my opponent was answering, brought this charge against his church; but I bring it now.

I am aware that I am entering upon an odious part of my subject, the very mention of which will excite displeasure in the minds of my Popish readers. It is, however, by no means my intention to displease them; and if they should feel themselves hurt by what follows, they ought to ascribe it to the subject, and not to the author, whose duty it is to expose all that he knows to be antichristian, and inimical to the happiness of society, in that church which ruled long over the kings of the earth; which is again assuming an imposing attitude in our own country; and

which can gain the ascendancy only upon the ruins of civil and religious liberty.

In argument, Papists sustain many disadvantages; but they are disadvantages of their own choosing, and from which they might free themselves, if they would occupy the independent ground which belongs to them as rational and accountable creatures,—that of forming their own judgment on all matters of faith and religious practice, without respect to the opinions of any man, or class of men, of ancient or modern times. I should find it impossible to defend the Protestant religion, if I were not at full liberty to form and express my own opinion of whatever was done by individuals or councils in the reformed churches. I do not know of one individual since the Apostles' days, or of one ecclesiastical council, to whose acts and canons I would implicitly subscribe. I am as free to form an opinion, and have as good a right to publish it, as Luther or Calvin, or as the synods of Dort or Westminster. If I have the happiness to agree with these in matters of Christian doctrine, it is not from any authority which I acknowledge in them, but because I see such doctrine taught in the word of God.

I am, therefore, not under the necessity of concealing or denying any thing which I believe to have been wrong in the doctrine or discipline of any reformed church. If, for instance, a Papist should tell me, that Protestant churches maintained intolerant principles, I am not obliged, for the sake of consistency, to tell a falsehood, and say, it *never* was so. I can readily acknowledge that the subject of religious liberty was ill understood by most of the reformed churches for more than a century after the Reformation; I can join in condemning persecution, for conscience sake, by whomsoever practised, and rejoice that it is now disapproved of by Protestants in general.

But when I say to a Papist, Your church maintains the principle that faith is not to be kept with heretics, he is not at liberty to admit the truth of this, or of any thing that is dishonourable to his church at any period of her existence. He dares not say, I am sorry to acknowledge that it was so at one period, but such a doctrine is now disavowed; because this would be to admit that his church had been wrong, which he considers impossible. He is driven, therefore, to the miserable expedient of denying the fact, however well attested, and of boldly asserting that it *never* was so; and the only argument which he has to oppose to the evidence of history is, that he and his brethren abjure upon their most solemn oaths the abominable principle imputed to them.

It is true that Papists in Britain declare upon their solemn oaths, that they do not hold the doctrine that faith is not to be

kept with heretics. This is well so far as regards them; and it would be utterly unwarrantable to accuse them of believing what they swear they do not believe; but then they ought to be candid, and confess that in so far they are dissenters from the faith of their church; or that the church herself has departed from the faith explicitly avowed by many of her divines, and confirmed by the highest ecclesiastical authority. This they will not do, for the church was never wrong, and can never change. They are placed in the most pitiable condition imaginable,—between the well known fact that such a doctrine was held by their church, their own abjuration of it, and the principle that the church is infallible and unchangeable.

I believe the doctrine in question is generally disavowed by the Church of Rome, in the present day; because it is one that cannot bear the light of the age.

The late Mr. Pitt, while directing his mind to the subject of what is called Catholic emancipation, addressed certain queries to six of the principal universities belonging to the Church of Rome, *viz.* LOUVAIN, DOWAY, ALCALA, VALLADOLID, SALAMANCA, and PARIS. His object was to obtain accurate knowledge of the principles professed by these bodies, with regard to the power which the Pope is understood to have over civil governors, and the subjects of states; and how far he has a right to influence the conduct of subjects towards their governors. All these bodies, of course, reply in a conciliating style. Their religion was always a very harmless thing, and it never interfered with the civil government of any country; in proof of which, one quotes the authority of Christ, to give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and the doctrine of Paul, Romans xiiith chapter, on submission to the powers that be.

One of the questions addressed to them all, is as follows:—“Is there any principle in the articles of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in breaking faith with heretics, or others, who differ from them in religious opinions?” The universities, with one voice, answer in the negative. Some content themselves by declaring there *is* no such principle maintained by the church; others declare that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catholic church; and one of the universities, (Louvain) is struck with astonishment that such a question should, at the end of the 18th century, be proposed to any learned body by the inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. Proceeding to a more direct answer to the above question, they say, “The said faculty of divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and that there never has been, among Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of

Rome, any law, or principle, which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves, in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns."

Perhaps some of my readers will be "struck with astonishment," and "perfect wonder," at the effrontery of this learned body of divines. I cannot suppose them ignorant of the fact, that the principle which they disavow was publicly maintained and acted upon in numerous instances, by those who directed the affairs of their church; and therefore their affected astonishment at the proposal of the question, is only a piece of artifice to give the more effect to their declaration, and for commending their religion, and those who profess it, to the good opinion of the British government.

In my last Number, I gave the bull, or indulgence, granted by Pope Clement VI. to the king and queen of France, by which he gave them liberty to break any vow, with certain exceptions, which they might have made, and which they did not find it profitable to keep, provided their confessor was willing to commute it for something else. This privilege was granted not to the king and queen only, but to all their successors, and is in full force at the present day; and as none of the exceptions regard vows or oaths to heretics, the sovereigns of France have full liberty to break faith with heretics, though bound by oath, whenever they shall find it not profitable to keep such oaths. I do not say that his Most Christian Majesty will ever do any such thing; but I do say he has the leave of the Head of the church to do so whenever he pleases. In short, it is declared to be lawful for him to break faith with heretics, or any body else, provided he has the consent of his confessor, who is authorised to prescribe some good work as a compensation for the violation of his vow.

Gregory VII. made a decree prohibiting all to keep faith with excommunicated persons, until they made satisfaction. Martin V. in an epistle to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania, says, "Be assured thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy faith with heretics." This is more than making it lawful to break faith with heretics,—it is making it sinful to keep faith with them. Gregory IX. makes the following law: "Be it known to all who are under the jurisdiction of those who have openly fallen into heresy, that they are free from the obligation of fidelity, dominion, and every kind of obedience to them, by whatever means or bond they are tied to them, and how securely soever they may be bound." On which, Bishop Simanca gives this comment: "Governors of forts, and all kinds of vassals, are, by this constitution, freed from the bond of the oath whereby they had promised

fidelity to their lords and masters. Moreover, a Catholic wife is not obliged to perform the marriage contract with a heretical husband. If faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other public robbers who kill the body, much less with obstinate heretics who kill the soul. Aye, but it is a sad thing to break faith. But, as saith Merius Salomonius, faith promised against Christ, if kept, is verily perfidy. Justly, therefore, were some heretics burnt by the most solemn judgment of the council of Constance, although they had been promised security. And St. Thomas also is of opinion, that a Catholic might deliver over an intractable heretic to the judges, notwithstanding he had pledged his faith to him, and even confirmed it by the solemnity of an oath." *Free Thoughts*, p. 119. with the authorities.

"Contracts," saith Bonacina, "made against the canon law are invalid, though confirmed by oath: and a man is not bound to stand to his promise, though he had sworn to it." Pope Innocent, in his bull against the Waldenses in 1487, by his apostolical authority declares, that "all those who had been bound and obliged by contract, or any way whatever, to grant or pay any thing to them, should not be under any manner of obligation to do so, for the time to come." Pope Pius V. by his legate, Commendone, endeavoured to persuade the Emperor, *nec fidem aut sacramentum infideli esse servandum*; that "no faith nor oaths were to be kept with an infidel." And through his persuasion, Maximilian was induced to revoke the permission he had granted for the Lutherans to preach in Austria. Charles V. having given his promise and safe conduct to Luther to prevail on him to come to Worms, was afterwards urged to violate it, by arresting Luther, on this ground, that "he was a man of that character to whom he was not obliged to keep his word:" to which he replied, "When good faith may be banished from all the earth, it ought to be found with an emperor." *Ibid.*

But that I may not rest on the authority of individual divines, however high in estimation, or the decrees of mere Popes, though generally considered infallible by their adherents; I shall go to the highest possible authority in the Church of Rome, that of a general council, and one of the very greatest general councils,—that of Constance; at which were assembled from all quarters, 346 archbishops and bishops, 564 abbots and doctors, and 450 prostitutes, with a sufficient number of barbers, musicians, cooks, jesters, &c. &c. of which a very particular account is given by Fox, the Martyrologist. The council has at least as good a title to infallibility as any general council that ever assembled. It met to judge, and did judge and depose a Pope, and appoint another. It established, as an unalterable law of the church, that the laity should not partake of the cup of the Lord's

supper; and this law has been universally obeyed in the Church of Rome to the present day. The same council established and exemplified this other tenet, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which never having been repealed, remains to this day as much a law of the church, as communion without the cup; though it is too odious to be openly avowed in the present state of society. The following is the council's doctrine on this subject:—

“The holy synod of Constance declares concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings and other temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither: and the person who shall have promised them security, *shall not, in this case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may have been engaged*, when he has done all that is in his power to do.” Ibid. p. 120.

The council having established this as a doctrine of the church, proceeded to practise it with savage and ostentatious triumph in the face of all Europe. The case is well known. John Huss, of Bohemia, was summoned to the council to answer a charge of heresy. His friends, fearing something like what actually took place, procured for him, from the highest secular authority, the emperor Sigismund, letters of *safe conduct* to the seat of the council, and back to the place of his residence. These letters were given with due solemnity; and the emperor, in effect, pledged his honour for the safety of the Bohemian. He came to the council,—was soon led to speak on matters of faith; and being found a heretic, was, as a thing of course, condemned to the stake. The emperor (at whose request the council had been called) interposed, pleaded his safe conduct to Huss, and plighted faith to transmit him home in safety: but the ghostly fathers taught him that faith plighted to heretics was not binding to the detriment of ecclesiastical discipline. Sigismund yielded; and Huss was committed to the flames.

Now, I challenge all the universities in Europe to produce higher authority for any doctrine or principle of the Church of Rome; and this must be the doctrine of the church still, notwithstanding the solemn abjuration of British Papists, unless she has undergone a change, which, in their opinion, is impossible.

The last general council was that of Trent. This body dis-

tinctly recognised the canon of Constance with regard to not keeping faith with heretics; and as there has been no general council since, it is impossible that such a doctrine can have been struck out of the Popish creed by any competent authority. The universities may declare what they please; and they may deceive the British ministry by a false representation of their principles; but the Universities are not the church. Papists will not be bound by their canons or declarations, while every Popish priest is bound by a solemn oath to adhere to all the canons of a general council, particularly that of Trent.*

This council was held subsequent to the Reformation, and partly with the design of discussing certain points at issue between the Church of Rome and the Reformers, and for healing the great schism. Protestants were invited to come to the council to answer for themselves, and give their reasons for leaving the church; but they, knowing what had taken place at Constance more than a hundred years before, and that it had been declared by that council that faith was not to be kept with heretics, did not choose to venture their lives in the hands of the ghostly fathers at Trent. This was the time to have disavowed the obnoxious doctrine, if it had not really been a doctrine of the church; and if it had not been a doctrine which the holy fathers of Trent approved, they might, by the high authority with which they were invested, have expunged it from their creed. But they did no such thing; and since that time there has been no authority in the church that could do it. So far from declaring that the Protestants were mistaken, and that there was no such principle of their church, as that faith plighted to heretics might lawfully be violated, they virtually admitted the principle; and by a solemn act, after long discussion, they agreed to exempt the Protestants *on that occasion* from the application of it; which they did in the following terms. "Moreover, all fraud and guile apart, the synod faithfully and truly promises, that she will neither openly nor secretly search for any pretence, nor use, nor suffer any person to make use of any authority, power, law, statute, privilege of laws, or canons, or of councils, particularly that of *Constance* or *Siena*,

* The following is the form of the Declaration, which every popish priest is required to make upon oath.—"I do acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ. I do undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church; I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize." *Free Thoughts*, p. 220.

in whatever form of words expressed, to the prejudice of *this public faith*, full security, public and free audience, which is granted by the synod, from all which it derogates in *this instance*. (*Free Thoughts*, p. 120 with the authorities.) The reader will observe, that the council passed from the law or canon (call it what you will) of Constance in *this instance*; but of course reserved the power of applying it in every other instance as it might be agreeable to themselves, or those who should execute the laws of the church in all time coming.

I shall probably pursue this subject farther in my next Number. In the mean time I shall give an example of the practical influence of the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, in our own city, in humble life, in the present day. A Papist who lived in one of the wynds, had a wife who is a Protestant. He used every effort to persuade her to change her religion; but she remaining inflexible in her heresy, he did not think it necessary to keep faith with her; and for the violation of the marriage contract, he had no less an authority than that of Pope Gregory the Ninth, which is given in a preceding page of this Number. He left her with a view to go to Ireland, for no other reason, as he himself declared, than because she refused to renounce her heresy. He was immediately taken ill, and died in a few days. His wife, notwithstanding his cruel and unjust behaviour, brought his body home, and had it decently interred. On his person was found the following letter, the original of which is before me. "Glasgow, December 5th, 1818. Dear Margaret, this comes to let you know that I am left this place, and gone to Ireland. You have yourself to blame in this, for if ever I was determined to go to the devil for any woman living, I would do it for your sake. Dear Margaret, I am very sorry you stand so much in your own light, as not till agree to my principles, for you said you would not never turn from your ways of thinking, so by that means you and I shall never agree. So therefore I bid you adieu, dear Margaret, for evermore across the main you need never look for me in Scotland again. As I said before, I will never send my soul to the devil for you or any other woman. I sincerely give my blessing to your son James. No more at present, but farewell for ever." The letter appears to have been unfinished. Perhaps he intended to add something to it, and send it from Ireland; but he was arrested by death while following out his wicked design of abandoning his wife and child. I hope this will be a warning to Protestant women to beware how they connect themselves with Papists.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXVI.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9th, 1819.

I AM about to discuss a little farther that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This seems to have been for ages undisputed by the doctors of the church. Heretics were considered such a race of beings, as to have no title to be dealt with as fellow creatures; and all the laws of a state were understood to be lawfully dispensed with, so far as regarded those who were convicted, or even suspected, of heretical pravity. We have many high authorities for this, in Limborch's History of the Inquisition; and these authorities are chiefly or entirely Romish, as the author did not choose to rest upon the testimony of Protestant writers, but rather to convict and condemn Papists out of their own mouths.

Thus it is laid down as a rule which was universally understood, that "Subjects, when a prince or magistrate is a heretic, are freed from their obedience." This is proved by a reference to history; and no one acquainted with history will deny that the fact is established. "Thus," says the author, "it has often happened, that kings pronounced heretics by the Pope, have, with all their posterity, been deprived of all their dignities, jurisdictions, and rights, their subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance and fidelity, and their dominions given as a prey to others.

"And, finally, they are deprived of that power, which is introduced by the law of nations, whereby they lose all property in every thing they have. *Cap. cum secundum leges de Hæret. l. 6.*

insomuch, that every one is at once wholly freed from every obligation he can be under, to persons fallen into manifest heresy. *Cap. absolutos, de Hæret.* Let all know that they are freed from the debt of fidelity, dominion, and all service, to manifest heretics, how strong soever the obligations may be which they are under. These things are thus inferred: First, if a heretic deposits any of his effects with any person, such person is not obliged to restore them to the heretic, after his heresy is manifest, but to the treasury. Farther, a catholic wife is not obliged to any duty to her heretical husband, because by the husband's heresy she is freed from her duty. In like manner, a catholic husband is freed from all duty to his wife, if she be a heretic. Nevertheless, they cannot marry with others, because the bond of matrimony is not dissolved. A husband cannot be forced to cohabit with his wife, if she is fallen into heresy, even though she is reconciled; nor is he bound to maintain her, because her dowry is confiscated by heresy; and as she is stripped of her dowry by her own fault, the husband is not obliged to maintain an unendowed wife. ZANCHINUS UGOLINUS explains this matter more largely. The very children, brothers, and sisters, ought to forsake them. Yea, the very bond of matrimony with such, is dissolved. For, if one departs from the orthodox faith, and falls into heresy, his wife is not obliged to cohabit with him, but may seek to be separated from him by the judgment of the church; such separation from the bed being as reasonable on account of spiritual fornication, as for carnal."—"Finally, all vassals whatsoever are, *ipso jure*, freed from every obligation to their lords, though such obligation shall have been confirmed by an oath."—These are maxims taught by several high authorities in the Church of Rome, whose names are given by Limborch on the margin of his work, vol. II. pp. 21, 22.; and they point out what was understood to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as plainly as any divine of the present day, in this country, can point out any doctrine of the Church of Scotland.

"Hence," continues the author, "proceeds the maxim, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which some are not afraid openly to teach, (that is, as lately as 1692, when the work was published;) although those who are more wise, in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, endeavour to wipe off this spot from their church. But the Spaniards, though they cannot be duly charged with this perfidiousness, because they have none whom they call heretics living amongst them, yet assert it in plain and open words, without dissembling, and are not ashamed to defend and confirm it, by the practice of the Council of Constance. See amongst others, *Simanca's Cathol. Instit. Tit. 46. § 52, 53, 54.*

Thus it appears, that little more than a hundred years ago.

the doctrine—that faith is not to be kept with heretics,—was taught openly, and in plain words, without dissembling, by reverend doctors in Spain, who had none whom they called heretics living amongst them; and they maintained the doctrine upon the authority of the Council of Constance; though in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, in which there were many heretics, the Papists began to wipe off this spot from their church, merely, I suppose, because they were ashamed of it, and could not decently maintain it, in the presence of those heretics, who had, by this time, made it manifest that they were of some use in the world, and not unworthy of having faith kept with them.

It is a curious fact, that though the doctrine in question was publicly maintained in Spain, in plain words, after other Popish nations began to be ashamed of it, it is now more indignantly disavowed by one of the Spanish Universities, than by most of the others; and this University (that of Alcala) condescends to enter into a long discussion of the subject, in which they attempt to vindicate the Council of Constance, with regard to their treatment of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. For the amusement of my readers, I shall give the whole passage, which affords as fine a specimen of Jesuitical reasoning as is any where to be found:—

“Answers to the third Question; (Among the articles of the Catholic faith, is there any which teaches, that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion?) So persuaded is the University, that a doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of the Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets; that she could not have believed it possible there should exist any person, who should dare to impute to Catholics any thing so iniquitous, had she not learnt, from the things which are written in the sacred Scriptures for our instruction, that the same Pharisees who had openly heard our Lord deliver this injunction, “Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s,”—afterwards laid this crime to his charge,—“We have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Cæsar.” But the devil who had put this into their hearts, and moved their tongues to the uttering of such falsehoods, as could induce the Jewish multitude, who considered Christ a prophet, to cry out with a loud voice, “Crucify him, crucify him,” has never since desisted from perverting others, in like manner.

“It was alleged every where against the Apostles, that they were seditious men, introducers of innovations, and both by their doctrine and conduct, aiming at the subversion of all legal authority. On this account, as St. John Chrisostom observes, the

Apostle of the Gentiles treat so often of keeping faith with princes, masters, friends, enemies, just and unjust; and frequently inculcates, that we must give them no cause of offence, but must do them every friendly office; and the same has been perpetually taught by the Catholic Church, in her writings, by her words, and her actions.

“ Still the father of lies has persisted in the same attempt. England is not ignorant of the calumnies vented against Catholics by the apostate OATS. The assertions likewise are well known, which maintained, with so much industry and art, the art of deceiving and lying, in which he so much excels. He was crafty enough to persuade some persons, that a canon was framed, in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from their religious tenets; and that a similar canon was published by the Council of Constance, by virtue of which, he affirmed, that faith was not kept with John Huss and Jerome of Prague.

“ But the first of these canons is not of the sixth general council, nor is it of any authority; on the contrary, it has been condemned by the church. As to the Council of Constance, nothing was there defined concerning breach of faith. If we were to determine the question from the acts of that synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion. For the fathers of the council declared, that therefore they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not granted him a safe conduct.

“ A safe conduct had, indeed, been granted him, by the Emperor Sigismund, who nevertheless, afterwards, ordered him to be burnt, but still without any breach of faith. For he had given him safe conduct only in the ordinary form, *viz.* against lawless violence, and with the condition annexed to it, that if he fled he should forfeit his life. Huss fled, in violation of his engagement.

“ To Jerome of Prague, a safe conduct was granted by the council itself, not including any special immunities, not authorizing any daring attempts which he should afterwards make, but upon this condition, that the course of justice should not be impeded. He was present in the council, abjured his heresies, and was exposed to no molestation. But when afterwards, contrary to his promises, he had taken himself to flight, and began to spread abroad among the vulgar, that he had consented to falsehood, in agreeing to the condemnation of Wickliff and John Huss; that he could find no errors in their doctrine; that Wickliff was an evangelical preacher; and when at length he obstinately maintained these assertions before the fathers of the council, Sigismund judged that such behaviour was not to be tolerated

in one who had broken his faith; and surely, what man in his senses would assert, that any one ought to be suffered, with impunity, to utter against God and man absurdities and blasphemies like the following: 1st. God ought to obey the devil. 2d. No man is a civil ruler, no man is a prelate, no man is a bishop, while he is in a state of mortal sin. 3d. That the multitude have a right to punish, at their pleasure, the crimes of the rulers. 4th. Oaths which are taken to confirm contracts, or civil negotiations, are unlawful. So much for those canons by which they have endeavoured to spirit up envy and odium against Catholics.

“Catholics have been taught by St. James, the apostle, that their speech must be Yea, yea; No, no: Guided by this wisdom, the Catholic church has ever reprobated falsehood. But to swear or promise any thing, without performing it, is falsehood. The Catholic church is not so devoid of judgment as to have enacted a law, or promulgated a decree, which would banish from the Catholic world excellent virtues, truth, fidelity, and justice, without which, there could be no happiness for individuals, no civil societies, nor intercourse among men. What Catholic ever taught that it was lawful to lie, to deceive, or to violate any natural right? Our religion, on the contrary, teaches that faith must be kept with all men, whatever be their religion, or though they be of no religion, without a single exception, in every promise, which of its own nature is lawful and valid, whether in peace or in war, in the concerns of religion, in matrimony, in safe conducts, in civil commerce with friends, with enemies.

“These being our sentiments, as may be evinced likewise by what has been said relative to the first and second questions, that the doctrine of the Catholic church may be clearly and distinctly understood by all the world; we shall only add, that no obligation arising from the laws of nature, or of nations, or of men, which is founded in natural reason, has been altered or weakened by our Redeemer; but that every such obligation has been rather heightened and exalted to greater perfection; has been strengthened by his doctrine and example; and by the addition of other moral precepts and councils; that the order of nature might be preserved in all human things, and that his grace might assist men to discharge their natural duties. This is the excellent philosophy which he brought from heaven, and introduced into the world, that he might form men to be useful and beneficial one to another, and obedient to the commands of the Divine Being.

“These are the unanimous decisions of this University, after a mature deliberation, in a full assembly of the doctors, the 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1789.”—*Parliamentary Reports*, vol. II. p. 529, 530, 531.

I have thus given the answer of the University of Alcalá at full length, because it enters more into the merits of the question than any of the others; and because, I suppose, their answer embraces the substance of all that Papists have to say for their church, on the subject of not keeping faith with heretics.

It is not doubted that the apostle of the Gentiles taught that Christians ought to maintain good faith with all men. It is not denied that the apostle James taught, "Let your conversation be Yea, yea, and Nay, nay;" and nobody teaches, so far as I know—that any law of nature, for the good of civil society, has been weakened by our Redeemer. All these things are irrelevant. The question proposed by Mr. PITT, was not, what Christ and his apostles taught. He had no occasion to send to Spain for information on that subject. It was, what has the Church of Rome taught or practised? Is there among the articles of the Romish faith, any which teaches that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics? This was the point; and the grave doctors should have kept by it. In dealing with a Protestant government, they had no right to assume, or take for granted, that their principles were the very same that the apostles taught; yet this is what is done by them, and some of the other Universities, who seem to think they have given a sufficient answer to the questions, when they cite passages from Scripture, which require the maintaining of good faith, and obedience to rulers and magistrates. If their principles and practices were founded upon the word of God, and regulated by it, we should have no dispute with them. It is because the Church of Rome was known to have professed and acted upon very different principles, that the Universities were called upon to give an account of what they really held. These bodies were, doubtless, competent to declare what was their own faith and practice; but when they take upon them to declare for the whole church, what *never has been*, we do them no injustice when we bring them to the test of history, to the writings of doctors, and the canons of councils, which are as accessible to us as to them; and had Mr. PITT gone to these sources of information, instead of trusting to the representations of men, who were interested in making their religion appear to advantage in the eyes of the British government, he should not have been so liable to be deceived.

But to return to the Alcalian doctors,—they do not content themselves with giving a simple answer in the negative, like some of their brethren, but condescend to argue the point; and they endeavour to make it appear, that the people of England are under the influence of the devil, and the father of lies, as the Pharisees were of old, because they believe that Papists hold the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. They do

not, however, condescend to prove any thing that they assert, with regard to historical facts. They refer to no authority either Popish or Protestant. All must be taken on the credit of their own bare assertion; and I have learned enough of Papists, to credit not what they assert, but what they prove.

OATS, it seems, had said, that "a canon was framed in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics." The doctors reply, that this canon is not of the *sixth* general council,—that it is of no authority, and that it has been condemned by the church. This is pretty plainly admitting that something of the kind had been publicly taught, if not decreed, by *some* council, though not the sixth; and to say merely, it has been condemned by the church, is extremely vague. It is certain, the principle was maintained and practised by the Council of Constance. Let the doctors of Alcala, or somebody for them in Britain, say when, and by what competent authority, it was condemned. Though an infallible and unchangeable church has no right to such a concession, let it be proved, that the doctrine maintained at Constance, has since been condemned by equal authority, and I shall give up the point. I shall then do the Church of Rome more honour than any Papist will do. I will say she is better than she was.

The assertions of these grave doctors, with regard to the council of Constance and John Huss, are so clumsily put together, and so easily seen through, that I have the charity to think the authors had not been accustomed to deal in falsehood. It is said to be an honourable thing to be awkward at making a lie; and this honour I cheerfully yield to the Faculty of Alcala. At Constance, they say, nothing was defined concerning breach of faith; and "if we were to determine the question from the Acts of that Synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion." The Acts of that Synod were to condemn Huss as a heretic,—to move the emperor to break faith with him, and to burn him to death, notwithstanding they knew that he had promised him protection. The fathers declared that they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not given him a safe conduct, though the emperor had. Most certainly they had a right to examine his doctrines; but what right had they to burn his person, when he came before them, trusting in a solemn promise, that no ill should befall him? The doctors admit that the emperor had granted him a safe conduct; that is, had *promised him protection*; and yet he ordered him to be burnt to death *without any breach of faith!* Surely this is the language of the beast that *is not*, and yet *is*.

It is pretended that the emperor's safe conduct was only against "lawless violence." But from whom was this dreaded?

Not surely from the grave fathers of the council. If it was from robbers by the way, a guard of soldiers would have been more likely to serve the purpose, than a slip of paper, or even parchment. It is absurd to speak of protection against lawless violence, in any other way than by force; for men in a lawless state would pay no regard to the signature of the emperor, or any body else in lawful authority. In short, it was not danger from banditti that Huss and his friends were thinking of; it was danger from the council, not lawless, but under form of law; and it was for security against this that they got the solemn promise of the emperor, who pledged himself for the safety of Huss to Constance, *while there*, and back to his home. "*Aller s'arreter, demeurer, et retourner*," says L'Enfant. And Dupin, a Popish historian, asserts, that Huss had liberty promised, not only in going to the council, but also in returning from it, which must imply safety while there.—"*Venir librement, et d'en revenir*," are his words.

It is added, by the doctors of Alcala, that there was a condition annexed, that if he fled, he should forfeit his life; and that he fled, in violation of his engagement. There is, however, no such condition in the document itself; and I take the whole allegation to be a fabrication of the learned fathers, or of their fathers before them.

With regard to Jerome of Prague, it is admitted that he had a safe conduct from the council itself; and he also was burnt to death. He did not, at first, possess the firmness of Huss. He was induced to make a recantation; but he did not long continue in this state of defection. Confessing his sin, in denying the truth, and making an open profession of those doctrines which were afterwards the basis of the Reformation, he was, as a thing of course, ordered to the flames, which he endured with great fortitude. The doctors accuse him of holding some monstrous opinions, and they seem to think this was a sufficient reason why he should not be suffered to live; but if he did hold all the opinions which they ascribe to him, he was more fit for bedlam than the stake. Here, however, we have the authority of the renowned University of Alcala for burning persons to death for mere opinions; and while they hold this doctrine, it is not worth their while to disavow the kindred one, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics.

More of this subject in my next.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXVII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16th, 1819.

I KNOW that my two last Numbers have given great offence to my Popish neighbours; and I must again declare, that it was not my intention to offend them, but to expose the wickedness of the church to which they obstinately adhere. They do not like to be accused of maintaining the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have the charity to believe, that some of them are not conscious of maintaining it: nay, suppose I were to take them one by one, and examine them judicially upon oath, I should find them all disavowing the abominable principle imputed to them. "Why, then," it will be asked, "do you persist in fixing such a stigma upon them?" I do so, because it is the doctrine of their church: I have shown it to be so by the most indubitable evidence, notwithstanding the disavowal of six universities; and because no Papist is at liberty to form an opinion of his own, but must receive implicitly whatever his church has decreed. It rests, therefore, with them to reconcile the doctrine of the church with their own solemn oaths. If they will adhere to their church, their oaths will prove them schismatics;—if they believe what they swear, they have abandoned the faith of the church, and have become separatists. Let them make their election. It will be well for them, if their choice shall fall upon the latter, and if they will, in reality, separate themselves from the kingdom of Antichrist, and, by believing in Christ, join themselves to the church of God.

It is, I think, a hopeful circumstance, that modern Papists are ashamed of the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have hope, however, only of those who are unacquainted with the controversy, and ignorant of their church history; for if there be any who are acquainted with these matters, and who yet maintain that such is not, and never was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, I hold them guilty of much worse than a mere error in judgment. I cannot acquit them of wilful misrepresentation and perversion of the truth. I am persuaded that the great body of Papists in Scotland, are really ignorant of the facts recorded in history, some of which I have brought into view. For the sake of such, as well as for the sake of Protestants, I shall proceed to

narrate the practice of the Church of Rome, agreeably to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, as exemplified by the Inquisition,—a court which is established upon the pure principles of Popery, and whose sentences all proceed upon the supreme authority of the holy church.

It is the grand object of this tribunal to find out and to punish heresy. Persons suspected of this worst of all crimes, when brought before the court, were usually tempted to accuse themselves, by promises that if they made a candid confession, they should be kindly or mercifully dealt with. The faith of the holy office was thus pledged to every merely suspected person who was brought before the court: and if such person was really a heretic; if he had really learned to believe as he was taught by the word of God; and if he honestly confessed what he believed,—the plighted faith of the court was broken as a thing of course: if he would not renounce his opinions, he was condemned to torture and death; and if he even did renounce them, he was condemned to suffer shame, and imprisonment, and penance, the remotest possible from the mercy and kindness which he had been promised.

When a person suspected of heresy is brought before the Inquisitor,—“ Sometimes he speaks kindly to him; pretends that he pities his misfortune; advises him to speak the truth, which he gives him to understand he is acquainted with; and intimates to him some hope of favour and freedom if he confesses: because the holy office of the Inquisition uses to show mercy to such who voluntarily confess their crimes, how grievous and heinous sœver they may be, and, in a friendly manner, speaks to him thus:— ‘ Don’t be afraid openly to confess, if you did happen to believe these sort of persons, who taught such and such things, to be good men. You believed them, and willingly heard them, and gave them somewhat of your substance, or received them sometimes into your house, or made confession to them; because you were a simple man, and loved them, thinking them to be good men, and knowing no evil of them. The same thing might have happened to persons much wiser than you, and so they might have been deceived. I have pity on you, and see your own simplicity hath deceived you, and though you are in some measure faulty, yet they are more so who have instructed you. Tell me, therefore, the truth, for you see I know the whole matter, that I may immediately free you, and show you favour.’ ” After this he interrogates him, not so much concerning the fact, as the circumstances of it, that the person may believe he knows the fact already.

In this manner, the Inquisitor endeavours to persuade persons to tell him all that is in their hearts. Those who are simple, and who cannot believe that there is so much wickedness concealed under the mask of kindness, are in general prevailed upon to tell all they know, if it should be against themselves,—if it should be

even that they have given a piece of bread, or a cup of water, to a person suspected of heresy. "If the person accused by this means, prays for favour, and confesses his error, the Inquisitor answers, You shall have much greater favour than you asked; but promises it only in general terms, for he thinks he fulfils his promise, in showing the least kindness to him afterwards. And when they promise to show favour, it is understood only of those punishments which are left to their own power, *viz.* several penitential punishments, because they cannot remit those which are appointed by law. They farther teach, that notwithstanding the promise of such grace, they may inflict penitential and arbitrary punishments; because, if after a long time, continual admonitions, and sometimes after the torture, criminals confess their offence upon the promise of such grace, the Inquisitors may legally and justly inflict more grievous penitential punishments, if they omit the lesser; for if one or other be remitted, they think they abundantly satisfy their promise.

"And by these flattering *assurances* they sometimes overcome the minds of more unwary persons, and when they have obtained the designed end, *immediately forget them all.* Of this GON-SALVIUS gives us a remarkable instance. In the first fire that was blown up at Seville, anno 1558 or 1559, (I suppose he means the first burning for heresy in that city) amongst many others who were taken up, there was a certain pious matron, with her two virgin daughters, and her niece by her sister, who was married. As they endured those tortures, of all kinds, with a truly manly constancy, by which they endeavoured to make them perfidiously betray their brethren in Christ, and especially to accuse one another, the Inquisitor at length commanded one of the daughters to be sent for to audience. There he discoursed with her alone for a considerable time, in order to comfort her, as indeed she needed it. When the discourse was ended, the girl was remanded to prison. Some days after he acted the same part again, causing her to be brought before him several days toward the evening, detaining her for a considerable while, sometimes telling her how much he was grieved for her afflictions, and then intermixing, familiarly enough, other pleasant and agreeable things. All this, as the event showed, had only this tendency, that after he had persuaded the poor simple girl, that he was really, and with a fatherly affection, concerned for her calamity, and would consult as a father what might be for her benefit and salvation, and that or her mother and sisters, she might wholly throw herself into his protection. After some days spent in such familiar discourses, during which he pretended to mourn with her over her calamity, and to show himself affected with her miseries, and to give her all the proofs of his good will, in order, as far as he could, to remove them; when he knew that he had deceived the girl, he

begins to persuade her to discover what she knew of herself, her mother, sisters, and aunts, who were not yet apprehended, promising, *upon oath*, that if she would faithfully discover to him all that she knew of that affair, he would find out a method to relieve her from all her misfortunes, and to send them all back again to their houses. The girl, who had no great penetration, being thus allured by the promises and persuasions of the father of the faith, begins to tell him some things relating to the holy doctrine she had been taught, and about which they used to confer with one another. When the Inquisitor had now got hold of the thread, he dexterously endeavoured to find his way throughout the whole labyrinth, oftentimes calling the girl to audience, that what she had deposed might be taken down in a legal manner, always persuading her this would be the only just means to put an end to all her evils. In the last audience, he renews to her all his promises, by which he had before assured her of her liberty, and the like. But when the poor girl expected the performance of them, the said Inquisitor, with his followers, finding the success of his craftiness, by which he had in part drawn out of the girl, what before they could not extort from her by tortments, determined to put her to the torture again, to force out of her what they thought she had yet concealed. Accordingly, she was made to suffer the most cruel part of it, even the rack, and the torture by water; till at last they had squeezed out of her, as with a press; both the heresies and accusations of persons they had been hunting after. For, through the extremity of her torture, she accused her mother and sisters, and several others, who were afterwards taken up and tortured, and burnt alive in the same fire with the girl."—*Limborch's History of the Inquisition*, vol. II. pp. 156, 157, 158.

The above is given as a specimen, taken almost at random, of the manner in which those who were suspected of heresy were treated by the Inquisition. It would be easy to fill a volume with such cases. The Inquisition, wherever established, was the constitutional organ of the Church of Rome. It acted under the sanction of the highest authority, and its acts are therefore those of the church herself; for, during the interval of general councils, the administration of the affairs of the church was vested entirely in the Pope; and he, by his supreme and infallible authority, invested the Inquisition with all its powers over the consciences and the persons of men. The systematical deception practised by the holy office, upon those who were so unhappy as to be brought before it, shows, in the clearest light, the doctrine of the church, that it was not only lawful, but even laudable, to break faith with heretics. It was the usual practice of Inquisitors to promise mercy to their prisoners, and to confirm these promises by their solemn oaths, in order to extort

something that should militate against the prisoners themselves or against their friends, and then to violate these oaths and promises in the most open manner. This was not the fault of an individual or two, who might be accused of having exceeded their commission, and whose crimes cannot be laid to the door of the church. It was the general practice of the whole body; and as the church has never condemned such practice, that I have heard of, she herself must bear the whole burden, and be content to have it fixed upon her, that she holds it lawful, if not meritorious, to break faith with heretics.

There is nothing in this that ought to surprise any one who knows the character of the Romish Church. Popery is a domineering and exclusive system. The Pope claims to have his authority from Jesus Christ, and all his priests derive their authority from the same source, through the medium of the Pope. What they are pleased to teach, therefore, they hold to be infallible and incontrovertible. Should a few individuals rise up in any country, in which their authority is generally recognized, and presume to think for themselves in matters of religion, they are immediately marked out as beings not fit to breathe the vital air. They are held in much greater abhorrence than thieves and robbers; and it is judged lawful to cut them off by all means, or by any means. Cutting them off is considered a most acceptable service done to the church, and of course to Christ. If one has given a promise or an oath to such miscreants, it is considered a promise against Christ, which may lawfully be broken; nay, which it is unlawful to keep. This was precisely the state of public feeling in the Romish Church at the time of the Council of Constance, and for two hundred years after. By and by, as Protestants began to multiply, and as whole states and kingdoms professed the Reformed faith, and were able to make a bold stand against Rome, and all her vassal states, Papists began to find that it was necessary to enter into negotiations and treaties with heretics, upon equal terms. It would not now have been prudent to avow the doctrine, that it was lawful to break faith with such persons or states, because Protestants were able to compel them to stand to their treaties, and keep their faith, whether it was agreeable to them or not. Accordingly, we find the doctrine was first disavowed in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, where it was most necessary to stand on good terms with Protestants; and was longest maintained in Spain, where there was not so much intercourse with them.

This doctrine was nearly connected with that of the lawfulness of putting heretics to death; and, like it, was understood to be lawfully put in practice where heretics were few, but might be suspended where they were numerous. "They are so far from being guilty of murder," saith Urban III. "that kill any who are excommunicate, that they are bound to exterminate heretics,

as they would be esteemed Christians themselves." And the learned CARDINAL BELLARMINE, one of the greatest oracles of the Church of Rome, teaches, "that heretics are to be destroyed, root and branch, if it can possibly be done; but if it appear that the Catholics are so few, that they cannot conveniently * with their own safety, attempt such a thing, then it is best, in such a case, to be quiet, lest, upon opposition made by the heretics, the Catholics should be worsted." *De Laicis, lib. 3. cap. 22.* quoted by John Smith, in his Narrative relating to the Popish Plot, p. 3.

The same doctrine was maintained by a Popish bishop in Scotland, in our own day. After attempting to justify the practice of the Church of Rome in the excommunication of heretics, and the laws which exist in Popish countries for the punishment of such, he says, "Here we must carefully remark, that these very laws subsist only where the Roman Catholic religion is the universally received religion of the country, and when a new heresy appears among them, and has not yet taken root; for when, through the disposition of Divine Providence, any new system of religion prevails, and is established, these laws have no more place: the Roman Catholics cease to exert even their spiritual jurisdiction against it, and by their principles, in order to restore religion, are obliged to return to preaching and sufferings." *Letter of G. H. (Bishop Hay of Edinburgh) to W. A. D. p. 40.* In reply to this singular passage, W. A. D. (Bishop Drummond of the Scotch Episcopal Church in Edinburgh) remarks:—"This, I think, amounts just to this, that Papists will persecute, or violate their faith to heretics, as long as they dare, that is, while they have the upper hand; but that whenever their adversaries get the better of them, they will graciously behave with more discretion. And is not this great condescension to accursed heretics, that Papists will not oppress them any longer than they are able?" *Second Letter to Mr. G. H. p. 32.*

The sentiments of leading men among the Papists in this country, I believe, are perfectly in unison with those of Bishop Hay; and it is not concealed by those who have the candour to speak plainly out. They profess great moderation; they declare their loyalty to the present Royal Family upon their solemn oaths. As their religion is not the established one, they have been "obliged," as the Bishop says, "to return to preaching;" meaning, I suppose, that if they were established, they would have something else to do; they would have to hunt out and extirpate heretics. And does any one think, that if this period should arrive,—that if they should become the majority in the

* I suppose the word should be consistently.

country, and have it in their power to establish themselves, that they would think themselves bound to keep faith with the few Protestants that might remain? That they would not, seems very evident from the following declaration of one of themselves. It is in the words of Dr. Drumgoole, in his celebrated speech at the Catholic Board, on the 8th December, 1813; the only man among them who had the courage and sincerity to speak the truth. Let this man's words be engraven on our hearts; for they unquestionably contain the genuine sentiments of every Roman Catholic in the kingdom. Speaking of our Protestant establishment, civil and religious, he says:—"In vain shall statesmen put their heads together,—in vain shall parliaments, in mockery of omnipotence, declare that it is permanent and inviolate,—in vain shall the lazy churchman cry from the sanctuary to the watchman on the tower, that danger is at hand,—it shall fall, for it is human; and nothing, but the memory of the mischiefs it has created shall survive! Already the marks of approaching ruin are upon it; it has had its time upon the earth, a date nearly as long as any other novelty; and, *when the time arrives*, shall Catholics be called, by the sacred bond of an oath, to uphold a system which they believe will be one day rejected by the whole earth? Can they be induced to swear that they would oppose even the present Protestants in England, if, ceasing to be truants, they thought fit to return to their ancient worship, and have a *Catholic King* and a *Catholic Parliament*?" *A British Protestant's Letter to the Inhabitants of Belfast, Dec. 2d, 1818.*

I shall leave it to Papists to point out, at their leisure, the mischiefs which have been created by our civil and religious establishment; while I believe that greater social and domestic happiness has been enjoyed under it, than under any other government in the world. I shall not dispute the doctrine, that every thing human shall have an end; but woe to our country, if things *human* shall give way to things *diabolical*, as will be the case, if our Protestant establishment shall be superseded by a Popish one!

I intend to return to the same subject in my next Number; and, in the meantime, I shall mention a species of breaking faith with heretics, which is very common among Papists in the present day. I allude to their practice of distorting and misrepresenting facts of history, for which their writers are most notorious, and particularly the Editor of the Orthodox Journal. If a person shall profess to give facts, and if, instead of these, he shall give falsehoods, he breaks faith with his readers; and the said Editor must know, that now some of his readers are what he will call heretics. I said in my Twenty-first Number, page 166, that in order to make it appear that Popery was more favourable to civil liberty than Protestantism, he had distorted and turned upside down

a number of historical facts. I come now to establish this by one instance, which I give merely as a specimen :

“Next,” says he, “came a lady, who is best known by the name of *Bloody Queen Mary*, from her attachment to Popery, and the sacrifice she made of some Protestant TRAITORS and REBELS, who wore the garb of prelates and parsons, in the latter part of her reign.” *Volume for 1818, page 366.* Who would not suppose from this statement, that very few persons suffered under the government of this Queen, and that these few suffered for treason and rebellion, and not for religion? No man could assert this without presuming greatly upon the ignorance and credulity of his readers, because there are few subjects of history, with regard to which it is so easy to detect his misrepresentation. No fewer than 277 suffered during the short reign of that cruel and superstitious princess; and they were neither tried nor punished as traitors. Nay, indeed, two of the number, who might have been brought to trial on that charge, were, on the contrary, examined only respecting the *real presence*, and other Popish absurdities. To many pardon was offered, not upon discovery of their accomplices, or acknowledgment of guilt, but if they would *recant*,—if they would go to mass. Besides, not one of these 277 suffered the death of a traitor, which is to be hung, drawn, and quartered. They were all burnt alive, which is the regular punishment of heretics in the Church of Rome. Nor were these *some* prelates and parsons only. There were five bishops, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Ferar, and Cranmer; twenty-one clergymen; and the remainder, two hundred and fifty-one, were private persons, men, women, and children. It indeed becomes necessary, ever and anon, to repeat these truths,—these tremendous proofs of Popish intolerance,—and the cruel dispositions of idolaters, lest the hardy assertions of equivocating Jesuits, and their disciples, being uncontradicted, should, at last, be admitted as fact. We will, therefore, detail one or two instances of this persecution. On the 15th of May, 1556, Laverock, a cripple, aged 68, and J. Apprice, a blind man, were burnt at Stratford together; and in the same month, another blind man was burnt at Gloucester. Was the Queen afraid of a rebellion conducted by the blind and the lame? On the 27th of June, at Stratford, just over Bow Bridge, were eleven men, and two women, burnt all together. Sixteen were intended, but Cardinal Pool contrived to save three. In July the same year, at Guernsey, were burnt in the same fire, a mother and her two daughters, one of whom being pregnant, was prematurely delivered in the midst of the flames of a boy, which some of the spectators endeavoured to save, but by the Popish dean and the executioner, it was thrown back into the flames to the wretched mother.—Enough, surely, of these horrible details. See *Antijacobin Review for Nov. last, page 274*

THE

Protestant,

No. XXVIII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 23d, 1819.

My three last Numbers have been occupied with that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This is a subject on which Papists feel themselves more hurt than on almost any other which can be mentioned; and I have given it more attention than I have bestowed upon some other matters, which appear to me of less importance. The doctrine has been disavowed with so much confidence by Papists in this country, even upon their solemn oaths, that I believe the opinion began to prevail, that it was not a doctrine of the Church of Rome; and that those who brought this accusation against her, were guilty of uncharitableness and injustice. It is, indeed, a doctrine that cannot bear the light. Those who maintain it, are not worthy of being trusted, with regard to any thing in which persons whom they call heretics, are interested. I think however, it will appear, from the evidence which I have adduced, that such was the doctrine of the church, as established by the Council of Constance; as expounded by several of her great canonical authorities; and as exemplified by the fathers of the Inquisition: and if it *was* the doctrine of the Church of Rome, it *is* the doctrine of that Church, for she is unchangeable and infallible.

Yet the very mention of it will put modern Papists out of temper. They have not the wisdom or discretion to admit what is undeniable; to ascribe it to the ignorance or error of the dark ages; and to plead that they are now under the influence of more enlightened principles. If they did so, we would give the same

credit that we give to other sects, who acknowledge and disavow the errors and mistakes of their forefathers, and who desire to be judged only upon the ground of what they themselves profess. But Papists will not admit that there ever was a dark age in their church. That which we look upon as a period of great darkness and ignorance, was actually their golden age : it was the period of their church's glory, when she reigned over the kings of the earth, and when sovereign princes, even emperors, were obliged to execute her decrees. It is clearly established, that in that state of glory she maintained the doctrine in question ; and from the acknowledged principle of her infallibility, it is no less clear, that it is, and must be her doctrine still.

About forty years ago, this controversy was agitated, and conducted with great warmth in our Scottish metropolis. The late Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen, a man who possessed as little of a sectarian spirit as perhaps any man of his age, in a Synod Sermon, happened to make some allusion to the Popish doctrine, "that it is not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, betray, or to murder, when the supposed interest of the church requires it." The then Popish priest in Edinburgh, G. H. afterwards, if not then, Bishop Hay, was pleased to come forward with a pamphlet, entitled, "A Detection of the Dangerous Tendency of Dr. Campbell's Sermon." He accused the Doctor, of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction* ; and challenged him, in the face of the world, "to produce any one approved divine, of the Roman Catholic communion, that either holds, approves, or even insinuates, the *damnable doctrine* which he lays to their charge." Nay, he says, he was "willing to venture the whole issue of his cause upon it, that the Doctor could produce no such authority."

This was bringing the question to a point which could easily be decided ; and it showed the great confidence which the Bishop had in his cause, when he accused the worthy Principal of the Marischal College, of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction*. Let it be observed, these are the words of a reverend Bishop of the Romish Church ; and I request that such of my readers as cannot endure to hear bad things called by their own names, will decide the question, to whom the charge of scurrility properly belongs. The Bishop challenged the Doctor, in the face of the world, to produce one approved divine, of his church, who held, approved, or even insinuated, the doctrine, that it was not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, &c. when the supposed interest of the church required it ; that is, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics : and he ventured the whole issue of his cause upon this point.

I do not know whether Dr. Campbell ever accepted the challenge ; but it was accepted by a reverend gentleman in Edinburgh,

Dr. W. A. Drummond, afterwards a Bishop in the Scottish Episcopal Church. This gentleman addressed a letter to Bishop Hay, in which he produced the most ample evidence, that the Church of Rome did maintain the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. He cited a number of passages from the decretals, from the works of eminent divines, &c. some of which are given in my twenty-fifth Number, and many more to the same purpose, together with the canon of the Council of Constance, in precisely the same words as I gave it from *Free Thoughts*; and, that he might put the sincerity of the Popish priest to the test, he addressed to him publicly the following challenge:—

“ And to bring the matter to a speedy period, I beg you may meet me any Tuesday or Thursday you please, between the hours of eleven and one, before dinner, in the Advocates’ Library, when the College Library is also open, in case we have occasion to have recourse to it; and that you may take along with you three or four gentlemen of learning, honour, and probity, who, like pious Job, *will abhor to speak wickedly even for God, or to talk deceitfully for him*; and I shall bring as many of the same character, who, together with those on your side, may be judges between us; and the new converts to Popery in this place may be witnesses if they please.

“ What I propose to prove is this, that, by the rescripts of Popes, the opinion of approved divines, and even the practice, I might say, the *decree* of one at least, if not more general councils of the Romish communion, it is lawful on some occasions to break faith, especially with heretics; and consequently to lie, to betray, and even to murder too, whenever the interest of the church requires it.”

One should think a public character like Bishop Hay, who had publicly challenged Dr. Campbell, in the face of the whole world, to produce the evidence of any one approved divine of the Romish Church, who held the doctrine above mentioned, could not, with propriety, refuse the challenge addressed to him, to come, with three or four witnesses, to the Advocates’ Library, and see, with his own eyes, the abundant evidence which that library contained, that such doctrine was indeed held and taught by approved divines of his church; nay, that it was most undoubtedly the doctrine of the church, as declared by the highest authorities. The reverend gentleman, however, did decline the challenge, though repeatedly made. He did not choose to look at the original documents, which proved his church to maintain doctrines which he declared to be “damnable” and “diabolical,” and which, according to his own words, none but “execrable wretches” could maintain. He declined the interview, says Dr. Drummond in his preface, “on this pretence that he will *publish* his answer to my letter.”

He did publish what was meant for an answer, in a large pamphlet of 150 pages, containing a great deal of matter a thousand miles from the point, and which seemed intended for no other purpose, than to raise such a dust about the subject, that nobody should see it distinctly. This seems to be one of the arts to which all modern Papists have recourse in their writings; and they seem to wish their readers to believe, that they have proved what they assert, when they have written a great many pages about it, or about something that is like it, in the mere sound of the words, however different in meaning.

Hay labours to show that the divines whom Drummond cites, and whose works are preserved in the Advocates' Library, were of no authority in the church; and asserts, that *he* had not so much as heard of some of their names. Of Simanca, for instance, whose words are quoted in my former Numbers, and whose exposition of the canon law contains clear proof that, in his time, it was a doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, Hay asserts, "that he was not a divine at all, but an obscure Spanish pettifogger, who published his *Institutions* on some branches of the law, perhaps to make a penny by it, and gives it the pompous name of *Catholic Institutions*, like many other authors now-a-days, who give their silly productions a grand frontispiece, to make them pass with the better grace."

This shows the dilemma to which Hay was reduced. He could not deny, that the words quoted by Drummond were those of Simanca; and these words point out what was the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as clearly as Erskine's *Institutes*, or other books of equal authority, point out what is the law of Scotland. He is reduced, therefore, to the necessity of making Simanca a poor pettifogger, who wrote books for his subsistence. But what is the fact? Let the reader judge from the following quotation from Collier's Dictionary, as given by Dr. Drummond, in his second letter, page 19. "James Simanca, Bishop of Bajadox, was a Spaniard, and professed the Civil and Canon Law in the *University* of Salamanca. He was one of the *King's Council* in Valladolid, and afterwards preferred, for his merit, to the *Bishoprick of Bajadox*, &c. He was a very good divine (*fort savant dans la Théologie*, says Moreri) and lawyer, and wrote a great deal in both faculties." Among his works are the "*Catholic Institutions*," from which Limborch, in his *History of the Inquisition*, has quoted largely, as well as the author of *Free Thoughts*, and from his work the point in question is clearly established.

There are, besides, many other authorities with which I shall not trouble my readers. The above is a specimen of the manner in which Popish writers of the present day, attempt to wipe off

the stain of not keeping faith, from their church; but they may as well attempt to wash the blackamoor white. Such of my readers as have access to the pamphlets on the controversy between the two Edinburgh Bishops, will find them highly interesting. For sophistry and subtlety, Hay far excels any living Popish author that I know of; but he is absolutely overwhelmed by the strong arguments, and the mass of evidence which Drummond brings against him. He had not, however, the grace to yield the point, though he had ventured the whole issue of his cause upon it. He challenged Dr. Campbell to produce evidence that such was a doctrine of the Church of Rome; and his challenge implied, that if this was proved, he would give up the cause. According to his own declaration, none but " execrable wretches " could hold such a doctrine. To accuse his church of this, was " diabolical calumny, and damnable detraction." Dr. Drummond accepted the challenge, and proved all this against the Church of Rome. He proved from the most explicit declarations of her own divines, and the canons of her own councils, that it was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics; and Bishop Hay himself lent the sanction of his little name to confirm the doctrine, for instead of giving up the cause of Popery, as he had virtually promised, when this was proved, he chose to continue a Papist still.

It being thus clearly proved, that this was a doctrine of the Romish Church, it follows that it is so still. To use the language of a late divine of our own city, (Dr. Porteous, in his Sermon on Toleration, 1778), " This wonderful pretence," (that of infallibility,) " gives uniformity and permanency to her doctrines; for what was infallibly true yesterday, might be equally true to-day, and for ever; no distance of time, nor change of circumstances can produce the smallest variation, even in things not revealed. This church, according to her own principles, must continue always, and in all respects the same. As the authorities to be appealed to on this occasion have the Popish stamp of infallibility, it must no doubt add greatly to the weight of their evidence. They cannot indeed be disrespected by Papists, while their claim to infallibility subsists." p. 18.

In short, it appears clearly established that every divine who wrote on the subject during several centuries, maintained it to be a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or to break faith with any person, when, by doing so, the interest of the holy church was promoted; and that this opinion of grave divines was founded upon the solemn decree of at least one œcumenical or general council.

Modern Papists endeavour to set aside the authority of all these divines, though their great oracle, Bellarmine, be among

the number. Bishop Hay challenged Dr. Campbell to produce the authority of *any* approved divine of the Romish Church, who maintained the obnoxious doctrine. Dr. Drummond produces the authority of *many* such divines. Hay then attempts to depreciate their character, and to make them appear men of no account; but in point of fact, they appear to have been all, and the only divines, who wrote on the subject for hundreds of years; and surely there is no other evidence necessary to prove what was the doctrine of the church, as understood by them, and as universally understood in their time. Let modern Papists produce, if they can, the authority of other divines, or the decrees of any of their councils in opposition to the doctrine in question. If it were not the acknowledged doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, whence was it, that, for hundreds of years, nobody wrote against it, while great divines were maintaining it? The Pope was always sufficiently watchful that no heresy should obtain a footing in the church; general councils were always ready to condemn any doctrine that did not seem consistent with the honour and prosperity of the church; and even in the darkest ages, there were to be found some learned men to write in defence of the church, and who would not suffer any person to calumniate her without attempting her vindication;—if then it had been a heresy that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, and seeing this *heresy* was publicly taught by many great divines, whence was it that no divine, or canonist, or pope, or council, should have uttered a word against it? Whence was it that Bishop Simanca, and others in expounding the doctrine of the Church of Rome, openly declared it to be a doctrine of the church, that no obligation under which one was bound to a heretic, was binding upon him? Whence, I say, was this maintained publicly and without contradiction, but from the simple fact, that it was universally acknowledged to be a doctrine of the church?

In illustration of this argument, I shall take a case from the history of our own national church. About thirty years ago, a divine in Ayrshire published a book in which he insinuated certain principles, which are known by the name Socinianism. Had this work passed unnoticed,—had other divines of the same church published similar sentiments, and had they also been unnoticed, it would appear to succeeding ages, that, notwithstanding the Calvinistic tenor of her standards, towards the close of the eighteenth century, the Church of Scotland had become Socinian in her doctrines; and it would be sufficient evidence of the fact, to adduce the works of learned divines, even doctors of divinity, who unequivocally taught Socinianism, and to have it to add, that no other divine of the church, or any author of that country, at that time, had ob-

jected to the principles taught in those books. It so happened, that legions of writers, if I may use the expression, many of them divines of great note, declared their abhorrence of the sentiments of the Socinian divine; many books were published, which are likely to live at least as long as his; and his doctrine was condemned by an ecclesiastical council, namely, the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, before which, in the town of Ayr, the said divine professed to recant his errors. While the knowledge of these facts shall remain, it will be evident to the whole world, that, in the eighteenth century, the Church of Scotland did not approve the doctrine of Socinus; but had the Socinian Doctor, and his adherents, been suffered to pass unnoticed, while they published their sentiments to the world, those who should live two hundred years after, would be justified in fixing the charge of Socinianism on the Church of Scotland, at the period referred to; and they might challenge the whole world to prove the contrary.

This argument applies directly to the case in hand. All the divines of the Romish Church, who wrote on the subject, during several centuries, maintained that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or with others, when the interest of the church might require such a measure; they taught this doctrine on the authority of the *Decretals* as they are called,—the standing laws of the church,—the authority of several Popes, and, lastly, on the high and infallible authority of the Council of Constance. This was so universally understood to be the doctrine of the church, that nobody controverted it. While Bishop Hay, and others, endeavoured to set aside the authority of those who publicly taught the doctrine, as being men of no consequence, they have not produced the name of any person, high or low, in the same ages, who opposed the doctrine, or so much as insinuated that it was not maintained by the church. Upon every principle of fair reasoning then, it was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, at the time of the Council of Constance, and for centuries thereafter; and if it *was* so then, it *is* so still, notwithstanding the solemn oaths of British Papists; for we must never lose sight of this fundamental principle of Popery, that it is unchangeable, and therefore incapable of improvement.

I suppose the late Mr. Pitt was no great adept in religious controversy; and, I suppose, his numerous admirers will not consider this assertion as derogating from the character of that great statesman. Since, however, Providence had placed him in a situation which admitted, and even required, a certain degree of interference in matters of religion, it would have been well if he had fully understood the subject. The interference of the Pope in the affairs of independent kingdoms, and the doctrine that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, seemed an insuperable bar to

the admission of Papists to the privileges of the British constitution, or of any Protestant constitution. They had the art, however; to persuade the British government that they held no such principles; they got the universities to disavow them, and to argue against them. This took place in 1789; and in 1793, the Act was passed which Papists take their stand upon, as containing the charter of their privileges. By this Act, they, taking the oath, of which the form is given in my twenty-fourth Number, are admitted to the free exercise of their religion, the same as other dissenters, and freed from the rigorous penalties of some former Acts, which, however severe and even persecuting they may appear to us, were, I doubt not, considered at the time they were passed, absolutely necessary in order to preserve the Protestant government from the incessant and insidious attempts of Jesuitical incendiaries, in whose esteem no work was so meritorious as the subversion of Protestant governments, and the dethroning of heretical princes.*

I am far from condemning the Act of 1793, or from wishing its repeal. But so far as the declaration of the Popish universities, and the representations of modern Papists, with respect to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, had any influence upon the mind of Mr. Pitt and his colleagues, in carrying that measure, I do not hesitate to say, it was produced by means of misrepresentation and imposition: for it is a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics; and let all statesmen consider, how it is possible to bind men who hold such a doctrine.

* It is the daily practice of Popish writers to hold out the government of this country, and the Protestant establishment, as persecuting and sanguinary in their conduct towards Papists. They glory in quoting old Acts of Parliament, which certainly do bear an intolerant aspect, and which every Protestant is ready to condemn. But Popish writers take care not to inform their readers that these intolerant principles were derived from Rome; and that our Protestant ancestors brought them from thence, with some other errors. Besides they were never so conspicuous in the practice of Protestants as upon the Statute book. There were many of our reformers who maintained, as a speculative opinion, the lawfulness of putting idolaters to death, (and among idolaters they very properly included Papists) but who never imbrued their hands in the blood of a fellow creature, or consented to the death of any man on account of his opinions. Their speculative opinion was undoubtedly wrong, but they learned it from the Church of Rome; the farther they removed from the Mother of abominations, they became less intolerant; and these persecuting laws have been repealed, though Popish writers wish to conceal this from their readers, and endeavour to make our constitution and government as odious as possible.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXIX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30th, 1819.

BEFORE I leave the subject of not keeping faith, I shall produce one document more. It is one of modern date; and it shows clearly, that, when Papists have the candour to speak their minds plainly, they hold the very same sentiments which were held by their fathers four hundred years ago. A Romish clergyman in Ireland, I believe a bishop, had promised to subscribe certain Addresses, with respect to the concession of the *veto*. Having refused to perform his promise, and being publicly accused of breach of faith, he published the following, in vindication of himself. *See Liberator's Letter to an English Nobleman, 1817, page 302.*

“An advertisement appeared in the *Leinster Journal*, of last Saturday, signed George Bryan, in which I am charged with the breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind, necessarily calls on any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of the facts, as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

“1st, I acknowledge that I promised, to some gentlemen of the Committee, that I would sign these Addresses, when some lines, to which I objected, would be expunged;—but I utterly deny having made any *solemn* promise, if by a solemn promise, Mr. Bryan means any thing more than a *serious* promise; for nothing, in actions, expressions, or writing, was superadded to the verbal declaration I made of signing the Addresses, when corrected. The nature of the case did not at all require a *solemn* promise; and the gentlemen who presented the Addresses to me, had too much sagacity and judgment to alarm my suspicions, by such a proposal; for the consequence would probably be, a rejection of the Addresses on the spot.

“2dly, Some days elapsed, before the corrected Addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval, many of the clergy and laity of this city came to me, and remonstrated against my signing these Addresses. They urged, that these Addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the Prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late Resolutions; that they were preparatory steps to the concession of a veto to the government, in the nomination of the

Catholic Prelates of Ireland; and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these Addresses prevailed, among the great majority of the priests and Catholic laity of the city. When I ascertained this last fact, I resolved not to sign the Addresses, and was, at the same time, persuaded that I was guilty of no sin or crime, by such refusal.

"I am convinced, that a serious, sincere, and voluntary promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. But I am likewise convinced, that the obligation, arising from a promise, ceases, in the following cases:—

"1st, If a man promises a thing impossible. For no one can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

"2dly, If a man promises to do any thing sinful or unlawful. For no promise, though confirmed by an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

"3dly, When a person, in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

"4thly, When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

"5thly, When before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen these circumstances, would never have made the promise.

"On this I rest my justification. For had I foreseen, or known, that my signing these Addresses would produce such alarm and consternation, such dislike and disapprobation, as I afterwards found they would, in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic priests and laity of this city, I would, by no means, have consented to sign them.—St. Thomas saith, 'That a man is not guilty of an untruth, in such a case; because, when he promised, he intended to perform his promise: nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed.' This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion of all the Theologians and Canonists I ever saw or read.

"JAMES LANIGAN.

"Kilkenny, Nov. 8, 1808."

I expect to be favoured with the unanimous thanks of my readers, for making them acquainted with this precious specimen of Popish morality. Here it is plainly admitted, that a man may give a promise, and a *serious* promise too, and yet lawfully break it, if it was not a *solemn* promise. And allowing it to be a promise ever so solemn, serious, sincere, and voluntary, there are yet five cases in which he is not bound to keep it.

From the first of these cases, we learn, that, if a man should give his promissory note, binding himself to pay a hundred pounds, by a certain day, if he finds it *impossible* to raise the money, he is freed from his obligation. "The obligation arising from the promise ceases," and the debt is cancelled. I admit, that no promise.

or oath, can bind a man to do what is sinful; but I maintain, at the same time, that no man ought ever to make such a promise. With Papists, however, this is a light matter; they can promise and swear any thing, and get a dispensation, like the kings and queens of France, to break such oaths as they cannot profitably keep. Promises to heretics are considered sinful, and, therefore, it is not lawful to keep them. On this principle the emperor was moved to put John Huss to death, and we find the principle approved and defended by a dignified priest in Ireland, as lately as 1808.

The fifth case releases a man from the obligation of his promise, on a change of circumstances. Thus, if I order from Dublin a quantity of linen, and promise to accept my correspondent's bill, for the amount, if the linen trade in Glasgow should become dull before my goods arrive, I am freed from the obligation of my promise,—the circumstances are changed; and because I intended to fulfil my promise, when I made it, I am guilty of no untruth, though I should now break it. This is the opinion of St. Thomas, who is of almost equal authority, in the Church of Rome, with St. Peter, and at least equal to St. Paul. And it is not the opinion of that divine only, but the opinion of all the Theologians and Canonists that were ever seen or read by the Reverend JAMES LANIGAN.

How different is this from the morality of the Bible? The righteous man stands to his engagement, though it should be to his own hurt or disadvantage. *Psalm* xv. 4.

The church that admits the principle of breaking faith with heretics, or with others, on any occasion, or on any account, teaches that it is lawful to falsify and deceive. And to fix this charge on the Church of Rome, nothing more is necessary than to adduce the principles and practices of the Jesuits. I have not seen any Bull of the Pope, by which he authorised this body to deceive the world, by means of cunning and falsehood, as he authorised the kings and queens of France to break any oath which they could not profitably keep; but I see, by the history of the Jesuits, that they acted as if they had had such authority; and that, instead of incurring the displeasure of the Holy Father, on that account, they became his distinguished favourites. Their principles and conduct are justly chargeable upon the Church of Rome, during the period in which they existed as an organized body; for they were never condemned by any Council of the Church, or by any Pope, till they became such an insufferable nuisance, in every country in Europe, Popish as well as Protestant, that the order was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. who, for his many good qualities, has been called the Protestant Pope.

Still, however, the Jesuits are the favourites of the Holy See. The present Pope has restored the order: and Popish writers,

such as the EDITOR of the ORTHODOX JOURNAL, labour to recommend them to the world, as examples of every thing that is great, and noble, and useful, in Christianity. But if, as I hope to show, their main instrument, in carrying on their operations, was falsehood, it will follow, that the church which contains, approves, and commends such an order, holds it lawful to falsify and deceive.

By the kindness of a friend, at a distance, I am favoured with a copy of *Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu*; or the Secret Instruction of the Jesuits, in the original Latin, with an English translation. This work was not intended ever to meet the eye of Protestants; and it was meant for only such members of their own Society as could be fully depended upon. "John Schipper, a bookseller, at Amsterdam, bought one of them at Antwerp, among other books, and afterwards reprinted it. The Jesuits, being informed that he had purchased this book, demanded it back from him; but he had then sent it to Holland. One of the Society, who lived at Amsterdam, hearing it said soon after to (by) a Catholic bookseller, by name Van Eyk, that Schipper was printing a book, which concerned the Jesuits, replied, that if it was only the *Rules of the Society*, he would not be under any concern; but desired he would inform himself what it was. Being told by the bookseller, that it was the *Secret Instructions of the Society*, the good father, shrugging up his shoulders, and knitting his brow, said, that he saw no remedy but denying that this piece came from the Society. The reverend fathers, however, thought it more advisable to purchase the whole edition, which they soon after did, some few copies excepted; from one of these it was afterwards reprinted, with this account prefixed; which is said to be taken from two Roman Catholics, men of credit."

Adv. to the Reader.

The preface to the work itself inculcates, "that the greatest care imaginable must be taken, that these instructions do not fall into the hands of strangers, for fear, out of envy to our order, they should give them a sinister interpretation; but if this (which God forbid!) should happen, let it be positively denied that these are the principles of the Society, and such denial be confirmed by those of our members, *which we are sure know nothing of them*; by this means, and by confronting these with our public instructions, printed or written, our credibility will be established beyond opposition. Let the superiors also carefully and warily inquire, whether discovery has been made of these instructions, by any of our members to strangers; and let none transcribe, or suffer them to be transcribed, either for himself, or others, without the consent of the General or Provincial: and if any one be suspected of incapacity to keep such important secrets, acquaint him not of your suspicion, but dismiss him."

Perhaps, at some future period, I may treat my readers with the whole of these secret instructions, which would not occupy above three or four numbers of my work. They exhibit such a system of deceit and falsehood, that I know no word sufficiently strong to express their true character, but that of *Jesuitism*. At present I shall give only a specimen, extracted from chapters vi. and vii.

“Of the proper method for inducing rich widows to be liberal to our Society. I. For the managing of this affair, let such members only be chosen as are advanced in age, of a lively complexion, and agreeable conversation; let these frequently visit such widows, and the minute they begin to shew any affection towards our order, then is the time to lay before them, the good works and merits of the Society: if they seem kindly to give ear to this, and begin to visit our churches, we must, by all means, take care to provide them confessors, by whom they may be well admonished, especially to a constant perseverance in a state of widowhood,—and this, by enumerating, and praising the advantages and felicity of a single life; and let them pawn their faiths, and themselves too, as a security, that a firm continuance, in such a pious resolution, will infallibly purchase an eternal merit, and prove a most effectual means of escaping the otherwise certain pains of purgatory.

“IV. Care must be taken to remove such servants, particularly, as do not keep a good understanding with the Society; but let this be done by little and little; and when we have managed so to work them out, let such be recommended as already are, or willingly would become our creatures; thus shall we dive into every secret, and have a finger in every affair transacted in the family.

“V. The confessor must manage his matters so, that the widow may have such faith in him as not to do the least thing without his advice, and his only; which he may occasionally insinuate to be the only basis of her spiritual edification.

“VI. She must be advised to the frequent use and celebration of the sacraments, but especially that of penance, because in that she freely makes a discovery of her most secret thoughts, and every temptation.

“VIII. Discourses must be made to her concerning the advantages of a state of widowhood, the inconveniences of wedlock, especially when it is repeated, and the dangers to which mankind expose themselves by it; but above all, such as more particularly affect her.

“IX. It will be proper, every now and then, cunningly to propose to her some match; but such a one, be sure, as you know she has an aversion to: and if it be thought she has a kindness for any one, let his vices and failings be represented to

her in a proper light, that she may abhor the thoughts of altering her condition with any person whatsoever.

“X. When, therefore, it is manifest that she is well disposed to continue a widow, it will then be time to recommend to her a spiritual life, but not a recluse one, the inconveniences of which must be magnified to her; but such a one as *Paula's* or *Eustochius'*, &c. and let the confessor, having as soon as possible prevailed with her to make a vow of chastity, for two or three years at least, take due care to oppose all tendencies to a second marriage; and then, all conversation with men, and diversions, even with her near relations and kinsfolks, must be forbid her, under pretence of entering into a stricter union with God. As for the ecclesiastics, who either visit the widow, or receive visits from her, if they all cannot be worked out, yet let none be admitted, but what are either recommended by some of our Society, or are dependants upon them.

“XI. When we have thus far gained our point, the widow must be, by little and little, excited to the performance of good works, especially those of charity; which, however, she must by no means be suffered to do, without the direction of her ghostly father, since it is of the last importance to her soul, that her talent be laid out, with a prospect of obtaining spiritual interest; and since charity, ill-applied, often proves the cause and incitement to sins, which effaces the merit and reward that might otherwise attend it.”

By such a course of persevering cunning and deceit, the Society of Jesuits have, no doubt, gained over many rich widows, to be subservient to their purpose. The title of the seventh chapter is, “*How such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.*” They must let “no week pass, in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart, out of their abundance, for the honour of Christ, the blessed Virgin, or their patron saint; and let them dispose of it, in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches: till they are entirely stript of their superfluous stores, and unnecessary riches.”—“If they have made a vow of chastity, let them, according to our custom, renew it twice a year; and let the day wherein this is done, be set apart for innocent recreations, with the members of our Society.”—“Let them be frequently visited, and entertained, in an agreeable manner, with spiritual stories; and also diverted with pleasant discourses, according to their particular humours and inclinations.”—“They must not be treated with too much severity, in confession, lest we make them morose, and ill-tempered; unless their favour be so far engaged by others, that there is danger of not regaining it; and in this case, great discretion is to be used, in forming a judgment of the natural inconstancy of women.”

“ Let women that are young, and descended from rich and noble parents, be placed with those widows, that they may, by degrees, become subject to our directions, and accustomed to our mode of living.”—“ That the widow may dispose of what she has in favour of the Society, set, as a pattern to her, the perfect state of holy men, who have renounced the world, and forsaken their parents, and all that they had, with great resignation and cheerfulness of mind, devoted themselves to the service of God.”

—“ Let several instances of widows be brought, who thus, in a short time, became saints, in hopes of being canonized, if they continue such to the end. And let them be apprized, that our Society will not fail to use their interest with the court of Rome, for the obtaining of such a favour.”—“ If a widow does not in her lifetime, make over her whole estate to the Society, whenever opportunity offers, but especially when she is seized with sickness, or in danger of life, let some take care to represent to her the poverty of the greatest number of our colleges, whereof many, just erected, have hardly as yet any foundation; engage her by a winning behaviour, and inducing arguments, to such a liberality, as (you must persuade her) will lay a certain foundation for her eternal happiness.”

Such are a few of the secret rules of that Society, which the Pope has lately restored,—which has obtained a rich establishment in the very heart of England; and which will, very probably, soon establish itself in our own city. Let every lover of his country, of his friends, and fellow creatures, consider whether it were not better for us to be invaded by a host of locusts and caterpillars, than by such incendiaries, who will insinuate themselves into our houses, and worm themselves, by fair speeches, into the confidence of the simple and unwary, until they have got the entire direction of our domestic affairs, the command of our property, and perhaps the disposal of our lives.

Before entering upon a new subject of discussion, I beg leave to congratulate my readers on the appearance of a reply to *THE PROTESTANT*; and that by no less a personage than WM. EUSEBIUS ANDREWS, Editor of what he calls *THE ORTHODOX JOURNAL*,—the great champion of the Popish cause for England, and now, also for Scotland. I dare say his friends think I ought to have noticed his publication sooner; but I did not choose to break the connexion of more important matter; and I was willing to let him have his own way for a time, without interruption. He has now published six numbers in Glasgow, under the title of *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*. The work is both written and printed in London. I suppose nobody, able and willing, could be found nearer Glasgow; and the Author calls for the assistance of the whole Catholic body, in his arduous undertaking.

I do not intend to enter upon a formal refutation of this writer, till I have done with *AMICUS VERITATIS*; but I shall simply state, for the information of my readers, that, in so far as it is my object to expose the errors of Popery, I look upon Mr. *ANDREWS* rather as an auxiliary, than an adversary. He tells us plainly, and I believe honestly, what his own faith is; and he assures us, that, in the Church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all. For the advantage which he has thus given me, I am content to bear all his abuse; all his real or affected misapprehension of the meaning of my words, which he exhibits in numerous instances; and all his insinuations, with regard to the badness of my principles and motives.

The poor man is seriously of opinion, that he must satisfy divine justice for himself. He expresses no small degree of wonder at the Protestant doctrine,—that Christ alone has made satisfaction. He is absolutely overwhelmed by astonishment, at an assertion of *THE PROTESTANT*, that “there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending, solely and entirely, on the finished work of Christ;” and he prints some of these words in great capitals, to show the magnitude of the mistake into which he supposes I have fallen. He knows nothing of the place which good works hold in the method of salvation, but as *meriting* salvation. In short, according to his doctrine, sinners must both satisfy divine justice for themselves, and merit their own salvation. I must do my opponent the justice to say, that this is not a corruption of Christianity. It is a totally different religion. It is as much opposed to the doctrine of Christ, as I hope to show in due time, as the worship of Juggernaut is to that of the true God.

While the “*CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*” takes his stand upon the ground of satisfying divine justice, and meriting salvation for himself, he is not to be reasoned with as a Christian. If the faith of one be the faith of all, as he tells us, then, instead of being the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world, as Papists proudly assert, they are not Christians at all. To dispute about the mode and form of such a religion as theirs, is as idle as to wrangle about the colour and shape of the broad cloth that covers the shoulders of the great idol of Orissa.

As my papers are often written in great haste, amidst numerous avocations of a public and private nature, without the assistance of any other pen whatever, it would not be surprising if I had made some mistakes, with regard to the dates of facts, the names of authors, and other unimportant matters; but, hitherto, *THE VINDICATOR* has detected nothing of the kind. In short, he has not invalidated a single fact, in any of my statements; and has not pointed out a single sentence in “*THE PROTESTANT*,” which I would wish to alter, if it were to be written again.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXX.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6th, 1819.

I COME NOW to the subject of withholding the Bible from the people, of which the Church of Rome has been accused. This subject, like that of not keeping faith with heretics, has become a little troublesome to modern Papists, especially to those who live among Protestants. About five years ago, the Rev. ANDREW SCOTT published the following declaration in the Glasgow Newspapers. "If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic Church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the Scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust. But I can publicly declare (without danger of being contradicted by my brethren, or censured by my superiors,) that it is *not at present*—that it *never was*—a principle of the Catholic Church, that the Scriptures should be withheld from the laity; and there never was any law enacted by the supreme legislative authority in the Catholic Church, by which the reading of the Scriptures was prohibited." *Letter dated February 11th, 1814., in most of the Glasgow Newspapers.*

In the same month a letter appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle, under the signature of W. M. from which I extract the following. "What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic Church? Are the decrees of general councils, sanctioned by the Pope of Rome, recognized as such? Then I request that the Reverend Mr. SCOTT would consider the following decision of the Council of Trent: (Regula IV. list of prohibited books) seeing it is manifest, by experience, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where, without difference, in the vulgar tongue, more harm than good results thence, through the rashness of men; let it, therefore, be at the pleasure of the bishop or inquisitor, with the advice of the parish clerk or confessor, to grant the reading of the Bible, translated by Catholic authors, to those who, in their opinion, will thereby receive an increase of faith and piety. This license let them have in writing; and whoever

*shall presume, without permission, to read or possess such Bibles, may not receive the ablution of his sins till he has returned them to the ordinary.**

“What is this but denying the use of the Bible to the common people? None were to read it, or have it, but those who had licence from the bishop or inquisitor; and these officers were authorized to give licence only to those who, they thought, would make a good use of it. That this was reckoned a very just limitation at the time, will appear from the speech of Richard Du Mans, in the same council. He said, ‘That the Scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines; and though they were formerly read in the church, for the instruction of the people, and still read in the service, yet they ought not to be made a study, *because the Lutherans only gained those who read them.*’

“If the above does not establish it as a principle, that the Scriptures were to be withheld from the people at large, I ask again, What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic Church?

“Besides, was it not the uniform practice of that church, for at least a thousand years, to withhold the Scriptures from the people? Was not their religious service conducted in an unknown tongue? Was it ever known that they gave the common people, in any country, a translation of the Bible in their own language, till a long period after the Reformation? Nay, is it not well known, that all the influence of the Catholic clergy was exerted to prevent the people from reading the Scriptures after Wickliffe and Luther had given them translations?”—“Mr. SCOTT says in his

* W. M. gave only an extract in English. The following are the express words of the whole canon :—“Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus, inde, ob hominum temeritatē, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parti judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum concilio Parochi, vel Confessorii, Bibliorum à Catholicis Auctoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui autem absque tali facultati ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolutionem persipere non possit. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usos pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisq; pœnis pro delicti qualitatē ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Regulares verò non nisi facultate à Prælati suis habita, ea legere, aut emere possint.” *De Libris prohibitis, Regula IV.*

The following is the latter part of the canon, in English :—But all the Booksellers, who may sell, or in any other manner supply, Bibles, written in the vulgar dialect, to any person not possessed of the aforesaid license, shall forfeit the price of the books, to be applied to sacred purposes by the Bishop, and submit to other punishments at the will of the said Bishop, according to the nature and degree of their fault: but let no one buy or read these Bibles, without the permission of their Pastors.

letter, 'If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic Church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the Scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust.' Well, then, by his own verdict, his church is convicted of cruelty and injustice, for they so far withheld the Scriptures from the people, that they did not give them when it was in their power; and when the people were receiving that invaluable treasure from another quarter, they did their utmost to prevent it; they not only refused to give the blessing themselves, but persecuted and murdered those who did." A sensible letter on the same subject appeared about the same time, in the Glasgow Courier.

Mr. SCOTT, did not choose to reply to either of these letters; but whether his silence arose from a conviction that he was mistaken, or from some other cause, I cannot tell. I have no hesitation in saying that he ought to have replied, and answered the question, what he meant by a "principle of the Catholic Church?" and how far he acknowledged the authority of the Council of Trent? If it be replied on his behalf, that he was not at liberty to make any exception against the authority of that council, seeing he had bound himself by solemn oath to believe every doctrine, and obey every canon declared by it, then I reply, he ought to have taken care what doctrine he published, so as not to have contradicted the holy council, whose doctrines he had sworn to maintain.

In one of my letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, (see Part I. p. 16.) I alluded to the controversy between Mr. SCOTT, and W. M. and mentioned his silence when the authority of the Council of Trent was quoted against him. In reply to this, AMICUS VERITATIS says, (P. I. p. 30.) "In your correspondent's last letter, I noticed an allusion to a Rev. Gentleman, which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *gospel* should be a minister of *peace*; and it was unfair to suppose, that because the Rev. Gentleman here alluded to did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your correspondent cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures. The Council of Trent, and the church, merely command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which is approved by the church; and consequently, cannot be said to forbid the reading of the Scriptures, any more than the Bible Society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist."

There are many strange things in this paragraph which require

a particular reply. The last is the first that I shall notice. The Bible Society, it seems, according to the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS, "will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version." The British and Foreign Bible Society has been accused of many things by Papists, and by Protestants popishly inclined; but I believe AMICUS VERITATIS is the first, and the only writer, who has accused it of *not permitting* the circulation of more than one version of the Scriptures. The fact is, the Bible Society never presumed either to *permit* or prevent the circulation of the word of God, in any version or edition whatever. The Society was formed for the purpose of distributing the Scriptures gratuitously, or at a small price, in order that the poor might have free access to the words of eternal life: and the Society made it a rule, which they had a right to do, that the version which they would print and circulate in our own language, should be the authorized one. But this is very different from *not permitting* the circulation of any other version. If I choose to give to a few poor families in the city a comfortable dinner from the stall of my own flesher, does this imply that I will not *permit* any family in Glasgow to procure a dinner from any other quarter? This is the amount of my opponent's assertion. The Bible Society profess to *give away* only one version in English: *ergo*, they will not *permit* the circulation of any other. A child would be ashamed of such logic.

But there is more in this than at first meets the eye. AMICUS VERITATIS wishes it to be understood, that, with regard to the circulation of the Scriptures, his church acts upon the same principle with the Bible Society. He knows that this Society is popular. He knows that they confine their distribution of the English Scriptures to the authorized version; and, taking it for granted that this is the same as *not permitting* the circulation of any other, he brings his church under the protection of this respectable Society, and hopes that all the friends of the latter will respect the former, for she does not permit her children "to read any edition of the Scriptures but what is approved by the church."

I am persuaded none but a Papist could have used the language of AMICUS VERITATIS, at least no enlightened Protestant would speak of either permitting, or not permitting, the circulation of the Scriptures, except it were in reference to the practice of the Church of Rome. From my opponent's own words, I hope to prove that his church is guilty of antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. He falsely asserts, that the Bible Society will not permit the circulation of any but the authorized version of the Scriptures; and he represents this as the same that is done by his church, that will not permit the circulation of any version but

such as she approves. The plain meaning of his words is, the Church of Rome permits the reading of some versions of the Scriptures, and does not permit the circulation or reading of other versions. I appeal to himself if this be not a correct statement of his sentiments; and I appeal to every reader, whether this be not representing the Church of Rome in the most favourable light, with regard to the subject in hand. Now, what I am to prove is, that the assumption of a power to *permit* the reading of the Scriptures, is antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. I expect MR. ANDREWS will be overwhelmed by astonishment, and perfect wonder, when he reads this sentence; and he will likely reprint it in large capitals to excite the amazement of his readers. No matter, I am perfectly serious in bringing this charge against his church, and I hope to make it good.

The Scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven. They contain a complete revelation of his will for the salvation of our fallen race. They inform us how our race became fallen and ruined, and of the provision which God has made for the recovery and salvation of miserable sinners, by the incarnation, obedience, and death of his own Son. That part of the Bible which is properly called the gospel, is purely a revelation of the mercy of God to sinners. It is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, upon the footing of what Christ has done in the stead of the guilty, when he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. The Bible informs us, how guilty and miserable creatures become interested in what Christ has done and suffered in the room of the ungodly;—that it is in the way of believing in him; for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, (John iii. 16.) This is good news,—it is glad tidings of great joy to all people, (Luke ii. 10.); and by the commandment of the everlasting God, it is to be made known to all people, (Rom. xvi. 26.) Christ gave commandment to his Apostles, to go into all the world and preach the gospel, that is, publish the good news to every creature, (Mark xvi. 15.) And he gave them a promise to be with them always to the end of the world, insomuch that their speaking was his speaking,—their words were his words,—he that heard them heard him. The words spoken by Apostles, therefore, and the words which they wrote, have all the authority of a voice from heaven. Christ is with his Apostles still, and he will be with them to the end of the world, to give power and efficacy to their words, because they are his own words; and whether they are published in the way of reading, or in the way of preaching, he gives them a spirit and a power which effectually subdues the objects of his mercy, and turns them to himself. The preaching, or in any way, the publication of the

gospel, is the means of divine appointment for the conversion and salvation of sinners.

In short, the Bible is the word of God addressed to his own creatures; and who are they that presume to *permit* the Almighty to speak to his creatures? The Church of Rome does so, according to the testimony of modern Papists; and it is understood to be great condescension in the church to grant such permission; for this is the same thing as granting permission to creatures to hear what the Almighty speaks to them. The reader will observe it is spoken in the way of boasting, at least in the way of vindicating the Church of Rome, that she does not *absolutely prohibit*, but in certain circumstances she *permits*, the reading of the Scriptures; that is, she permits fallen and miserable creatures to hear what their Creator says to them, which is the same thing as permitting the Almighty to speak to them.

Where was there ever greater arrogance and presumption? Is it possible to imagine greater contempt of divine authority, and more direct rebellion against the Majesty of heaven, than this affected condescension of the Romish Church? She does not *absolutely forbid* the Almighty to speak to his creatures,—she *permits* it in certain circumstances.

In the Bible, the Almighty addresses us as by a voice from heaven, “Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else,” (Isa. xlv. 22.) The Church of Rome stands by, and presumes to decide who shall, and who shall not, hear these words of the Almighty Saviour; and if any person at all hear them, it is by her permission. Surely, then, this Church of Rome is that Antichrist, that opposing power that exalts itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. To assume the power of permitting creatures to hear what God shall speak, is assuming a power and authority at least equal to that of God, and a right to controul, or at least to regulate the manner of his communicating his will to his own creatures.

I shall suppose a case, which I hope is level to the capacity of all my readers. I shall suppose there were some traitors in our city, or in the neighbourhood, and, suppose the Prince Regent, acting in name and on behalf of his Majesty, extremely averse from persecuting these traitors so as to affect their lives, issued a proclamation, promising a free pardon to all who would submit themselves to the authority of the laws:—Now, suppose that our Lord Provost and Magistrates were to call a council, and make it a matter of consideration, whether or *not* they would *permit* the said proclamation to be published in Glasgow; and if they should even come to the decision that they would *permit* it, would not they themselves be held as traitors, merely for presuming to put their authority on a footing with that of the sovereign, and presuming to *permit* his proclamation to be published.

This is precisely the case with the Church of Rome, upon the most partial view of her conduct, as given by her own friends. The gospel of Christ is a proclamation of mercy to rebels and traitors. It is contained in the Bible. And as the Church of Rome claims the power of granting permission, only in certain circumstances, to read the Bible, she places her authority, at least, upon an equality with the authority of God, by determining whether or not the said proclamation of mercy shall be published,—who shall, and who shall not be allowed to hear it.

Thus, the very condescension of the Church of Rome,—her permitting the reading of the Scriptures in certain circumstances, of which her friends make a boast,—is proved to be impious presumption, and rebellion against God. It is arrogating an authority which belongs to no creature, nor to any assembly of creatures, to decide when and to whom the Almighty shall address his overtures of mercy and grace; and who shall hear that gospel which he commanded to be preached to every creature.

I have hitherto been arguing on the most favourable view of the conduct of the Church of Rome,—that she does *permit* the reading of the Scriptures in certain circumstances. The claim of an authority to permit, indicates her antichristian temper; and this very claim implies an authority to prevent the reading of the Scriptures, whenever it shall happen that prevention is more agreeable to her than permission. This in general has been the case: and if her assumed authority of permitting, proves her to be the Antichrist, much more will her assumed authority of preventing, fix that character upon her.

AMICUS VERITATIS says, that I cannot produce any authority of the Council of Trent *absolutely forbidding* the reading of the Scriptures. This is admitting that the reading of them is forbidden, but not *absolutely*; and this is precisely the import of the canon of the said council. The reading of the Bible is forbidden generally; but there are exceptions. It is not forbidden to clergymen. It is not even forbidden to such discreet laymen as are otherwise secured from being hurt by it, provided they read only such translations as have been made by Catholic authors; but to the great body of the people it is forbidden. The bishops and inquisitors are constituted sole judges, who are and who are not fit to be trusted with the word of God, even after it has been neutralized by the corrupt glosses of translators and commentators: and if any poor layman should be detected with a Bible in his possession, though it should be one of those which have been fenced by Popish annotations, he is considered guilty of so great a crime, that he cannot receive the ablution,—the pardon, or washing from his sins, till he has sent away the Bible from his house. This is the express law of the Church of Rome, as it was decreed by the Council of Trent, and as it stands at this day; for every

Popish priest is taken bound by solemn oath to adhere to all the doctrines and canons of that council.

The Almighty addresses his word to every child of Adam: but the Church of Rome forbids any of its members to hear or to read it, but a favoured few, who must have a license for the purpose! This is directly setting up her authority against the authority of God. He calls upon all men to hear him. His voice is to the sons of men. It is addressed to all ranks and classes of the human race without exception. But the Church of Rome will not suffer *all men* to hear the voice of God in his word. She allows it to be addressed only to such as will receive thereby an *increase* of faith and piety; that is, to persons who are already faithful and pious in some degree. God addresses his gospel to sinners, as such, in order that, hearing and believing it, sinners may be saved. But the Church of Rome exercises her authority to prevent, as far as she is able, the word of God from reaching the ears of sinners. Thus, she proves herself to be in league with Satan, for the purpose of keeping men under the bondage of sin, to the everlasting ruin of their souls.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us, in plain words, without dissembling, that the church *commands* her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which she approves; and he says, the Council of Trent and the church *merely* do this, as if it were a small matter; but in fact, this was an absolute prohibition of reading the Bible, to at least nine-tenths of the people, for the only edition or version that was approved by the Church, for many centuries, was the Latin Vulgate, which none but the learned could read. Commanding her children, therefore, to read no other, was an absolute prohibition to the unlearned. It does not appear that even the original Hebrew and Greek, the very words which were written by Prophets and Apostles, were approved by the Church of Rome. At least, in order to discourage the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues, the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate to be of equal authority, which is the doctrine of the Church on this subject.

I begin to think that my work is rising in public esteem, and that it is exciting great attention; seeing the Socinians have begun to make use of the Title, for the purpose of giving currency to their nostrums. I can conceive no other object which a "Layman" could have in view, in his Sixpenny Letter to the PROTESTANT, which was published on Wednesday last. This I think, is all the reply that such a publication requires from the PROTESTANT, who is not so idle as to take up the Socinian controversy immediately after it has been so ably handled by Mr. WARDLAW.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXXI.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13th, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells me, that I “cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures.” Then he informs me that “the Council of Trent, and the Church, *merely* command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures, but that which is approved by the Church.” I shewed, in my last Number, that this *mere* command was, for several centuries, the same thing as an absolute prohibition; for the only version approved by the Church was the Latin Vulgate; and the command of the Church to read no other, was really a command to the unlearned not to read the Scriptures at all. I shewed also, that the assumption of a power to grant permission to read the Bible, was no less than assuming a power to permit the Almighty to speak to his creatures, which is antichristian arrogance and presumption.

It is no better, whatever worse, to assume the power of *preventing* the reading of the Bible. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and AMICUS VERITATIS virtually admits the fact, by asserting that she merely commanded her children not to read any version but such as she approved; that is, only the Latin Vulgate. Suppose the people were eagerly desiring instruction; suppose they were hungering for the bread of life, that is, desiring to possess and know the word of God, the Church of Rome presents it to them in Latin,—a language which they do not understand,—and commands them not to receive it in any other language. What is this but giving the people a stone instead of bread? What is it but saying to the poor, be thou warmed, be thou clothed, and yet not giving them the things which are needful for these purposes? The apostle James has taught us how to estimate such pretensions to charity.

The word of God was given to the Church in Rome, as it was given to other churches, for the instruction and edification of her members, and for the rule of their conduct. I say the Church *in* Rome; for the Bible knows nothing of the Church *of* Rome, but as the Antichrist, the grand apostacy that should arise in the latter days. The Church in Rome was a company of believers in the saving truths of the gospel, who made a public and explicit profession of their faith in Christ, and who remained steadfast in the faith, notwithstanding the opposition which they had to encounter; insomuch, that their faith was spoken of throughout

* * *

the whole world. This Church claimed no authority over any other church. It was content to hold communion with the Church in Jerusalem, and with every other church of Christ, upon a footing of perfect equality. It was favoured by a letter from the apostle Paul, and by his personal ministry for a time; not by the ministry of Peter, for it has not yet been proved that the latter apostle was ever in Rome.

There is no reason to doubt that while the Church in Rome continued to hold the faith of the gospel, they would hold by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and also of the New Testament, as they were communicated to them; and they would consider it the duty of every member to read, and hear, and understand what God said to him, in the holy writings. By reading and understanding these, they would become wise unto salvation; and they would endeavour to communicate the knowledge of them to all around.

But in process of time, a deplorable change took place. The Church *in* Rome became the Church *of* Rome. The society of believers in that city was superseded by a motley group of persons of the city,—of mere worldly men,—who soon began to mould the Church according to the maxims of the world. By the time of Constantine the Great, it had become a worldly society: he took it into union with the state, became its patron, and virtually its head and governor.

Christianity now became popular and fashionable. Multitudes of heathens flocked into the Church and they were cordially received, without any evidence of their having embraced the faith of Christ, and thereby become new creatures. They were old men under a new name,—still heathens, under the name of Christians. Such persons could not submit to the simplicity of the gospel. It was necessary to introduce into Christian worship a number of heathen rites, to please the heathen converts; and thus, in a short time, what was called Christianity was little better than the old Roman idolatry.

In this state of things, it became necessary to keep the Bible out of the view of the common people. Christianity, as represented in that book, was quite a different thing from the system maintained by the Romish priests. They gave themselves out as the only channels through which the blessings of Heaven were dispensed to men. The influences of the Holy Ghost, as they taught, could be communicated only through them. Originally, a church meant a society of believers: now the priests claimed the title to themselves; and they gave out their decrees as having infallible authority. In such circumstances, they had no use for the Bible. Infallible bodies, as general councils professed to be, could not be subject to any authority but their own. The original Scriptures were suffered to be neglected. Happily there was a translation made into Latin, before the Church had reached the summit of corruption; and this Latin version, called the Vulgate, was no doubt the means of preserving and com-

municating the knowledge of real Christianity to many individuals during the dark ages. But the Latin became a dead language, and was not understood by the common people in any country. It was the interest of the priests to keep the sacred word thus locked up from the sight of vulgar eyes; and, for several centuries, there was no attempt made by the Church of Rome to give a version of it, in the vulgar tongue of any nation. Thus, practically, the Church was guilty of withholding the Bible from the people; and, therefore, guilty of cruelty and injustice, according to the declaration of the Rev. ANDREW SCOTT, as quoted in my last Number.

There were, however, some individuals, whose names ought to be held in everlasting remembrance, who having derived the knowledge of salvation from the Latin Bible, desired to communicate the contents of the blessed book to their countrymen, in their own language. Among these, John Wickliffe, of England, holds a distinguished place. Wickliffe found in the Bible a purer Christianity than that which he saw every where professed; and he could not rest till he had given his countrymen a version of the word of God, in their vulgar tongue.

Now, what was the consequence? The Church of Rome took the alarm. Of all the dreadful things in the world, the Bible was most to be dreaded. When Wickliffe published his translation, Pope Gregory sent a bull to the university of Oxford, in 1378, in which the translator, who was a Professor of Divinity in that university, was described as "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also vomiting, out of the filthy dungeon of his breast, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies." The object of this bull was to excite a persecution against Wickliffe, for having translated the Scriptures; and although he was preserved from it, during his lifetime, yet the malice of his persecutors continued, and they were not satisfied until they had dug up his bones and burnt them, many years after his death.

"Afterwards, when a new translation was made, and printed by Tindal, a proclamation was set forth, in 1546, by the king for the abolishing of English books, published under pretence of expounding and declaring the truth of God's Scripture; and it was directed, that, from henceforth, no man, woman, or person, of what estate, condition, or degree soever he be, or they be, shall, after the last day of August next ensuing, receive or have, take or keep, in his possession, the text of the New Testament, of Tindal or Coverdale's translation into English." See *Mr. Fox's Account of the Proceedings of the Lancasterian School Society in Glasgow*, pp. 69, 70.

"When Luther had commenced the glorious work of reformation on the Continent, and printed the Scriptures in the German language, Pope Leo X. issued a bull against him, couched in the most violent and opprobrious terms, and, after having called

upon the Lord to rise up, and the apostles Peter and Paul to rise up, against the foxes which had risen up, seeking to destroy the vineyard, lest these heresies should further increase, and these foxes gather strength against us, he adds, ‘ Finally, let the whole universal church of God’s saints and doctors rise up, whose true expounding of holy Scriptures being rejected, certain persons, (whose hearts the father of lies hath blinded,) wise in their own conceits, (as the manner of heretics is,) do expound the Scriptures otherwise than the Holy Ghost doth require, following only their own sense of ambition and vain-glory, yea, rather do wrest and adulterate the Scriptures. So that, as *Hierome* saith, now they make it not the gospel of Christ, but of man; or, which is worse, of the devil. Let all the holy church, I say, rise up, and, with the blessed apostles together, make intercession to Almighty God, that the errors of all schismatics being rooted and stocked up, his holy church may be continued in peace and unity.’

“ This bull farther condemned all persons who did not surrender Luther’s books, and it was the forerunner of one of the most bloody persecutions which ever fell upon the earth. The time would fail me to record the histories of those of whom the world was not worthy, who were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; but I wish to produce two examples:— In 1514, Richard Hunne, of London, who was murdered in his prison, was charged with various religious offences, one of which was, ‘ that he had, in his keeping, divers English books, prohibited and *damned* by the law; as, the Apocalypse, in English, Epistles and Gospels, in English,’ &c. and he was further charged, that ‘ he defendeth the translation of the Bible and holy Scriptures into the English tongue, *which is prohibited by the laws of our holy mother church.*’ ” See *Mr. Fox’s Pamphlet*, as above.

From these facts it is perfectly evident, that it was understood to be a law of the Church of Rome, that the Bible was, by all means, to be withheld from the common people. The Scriptures in English, and, of course, the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue of any nation, were prohibited, in most cases, *absolutely prohibited*, ‘ by the laws of our holy mother church.’

I grant, that, after the Reformation, the Church of Rome began to *permit* the translation of the Scriptures into modern languages, by Popish translators; and generally with notes and annotations, to guard the faithful from the danger that might arise from reading the simple unadulterated word of truth. Yet even this was considered as a dangerous experiment; and it was judged best not to give the people the Bible, in their own language, except when there was danger of their receiving it from Protestants. The Rhemish translators, as we shall see by and by, plainly avow this as the motive of their undertaking.

It is worthy of remark, that, in one instance at least, the Pope was more forward in granting the Bible to the people, in their own language, than most of his clergy were. It is recorded of Pope

Sixtus V. (*See his Life*, 8vo. p. 562.)—"He had caused the Vulgate Latin edition of the Bible to be published, the last year, which occasioned a good deal of clamour in the world; but nothing like what there was this year, (1589,) upon his printing an Italian version of it. This set all the Roman Catholic part of Christendom in an uproar. Count Olivarez, and some of the Cardinals, ventured to expostulate with him pretty freely upon it, and said, it was a scandalous, as well as a dangerous thing, and *bordered very nearly upon heresy*. But he treated them with contempt, and only said, *we do it for the benefit of you that don't understand Latin*. The most zealous of the Cardinals wrote to the King of Spain, intreating him to interpose, and think of some remedy for this evil, as he was more interested in it than any one else, with regard to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, and the Duchy of Milan; for, if the Bible should come to be publicly read there, in the vulgar tongue, it might raise scruples and uneasinesses in the consciences of those people: as it was, besides, one of the first principles of heretics to read the Scriptures in the common tongue.

"Philip, who was a furious bigot, ordered his ambassador to use his utmost endeavours with the Pope to suppress this edition, as it would give infinite offence; and said, if he did not, he should be obliged to make use of such means to prevent its being read, in his kingdoms, as his zeal for true religion suggested, and the Almighty had put into his hands. Olivarez, having received these orders, immediately demanded an audience of the Pope, and represented to him, with much warmth, how disagreeable this new version was to his master, and what scandal it gave to his whole court. Sixtus suffered him to harangue, with great vehemence, for above an hour, and when he was come to the end of his career, made no answer. Upon which the Count said, 'Won't your Holiness be pleased to let me know your thoughts upon this matter?' 'I am thinking,' says Sixtus, 'to have you thrown out of the window, to teach other people how to behave, when they address themselves to the Pontiff;' and immediately made haste out of the apartment. The poor ambassador, who was sufficiently acquainted with the temper of Sixtus, made haste out of the Vatican, expecting he would have been as good as his word; and when he got home, and had recovered his spirits a little, said, 'Thank God, I have had a great escape to day.'

This shows the manner in which the Pope could speak to the ambassadors of the greatest monarchs in Europe. And it shows clearly that the feeling of the Church, and of the Cardinals, and the King of Spain, in particular, was so decidedly against giving the Bible to the people, in their own language, that the very Head of the Church incurred some danger, at least great opposition, when he was determined to publish an Italian version, for the use of his own countrymen. Sixtus was extremely arbitrary in his administration, and sometimes whimsical in his actions

Of the latter, I suppose, his Italian version of the Bible, will be considered an evidence. It does not appear, from his history, that he cared much for the doctrine of the Bible, or for any thing else, human or divine, but as it might serve to promote the purposes of his own vanity and ambition. I believe his version of the Scriptures, in Italian, was not extensively circulated. It is probable, his successors would take care to have it suppressed.

More lately, it was judged proper to give the Italians something that should pass for a Bible, in their own language. This was done under the title of *Storia del Vecchio e Nuovo Testamento*, &c. This is a collection of stories taken from the historical parts of Scripture, with what are called moral reflections; and the book is that which is, at this day, presented to a stranger in Italy, when he inquires for a Bible. The following translation of a part of the preface will shew that, in the opinion of the editor, who no doubt spoke what he understood to be the doctrine of the Church, the whole Bible was not to be given to the people, in their own language. After complaining of the evil of reading comedies, romances, &c. he says, "I believe that some excuse so pernicious an abuse with the vain pretext of the necessity of diverting themselves with the reading of delightful books, they not being permitted to find this entertainment in the historical books of the sacred Scriptures, because they do not understand the Latin language; and for just reasons, the vulgar being forbidden them by the Church, think themselves constrained to have recourse to profane books.

"There is nothing more established by common consent of all the holy fathers, than the respect that Christians are bound to have for the word of God, and the care with which they ought to seek the rule of good living for salvation. And as these saints perfectly knew the profundity of the sacred Scripture, which is filled with mysteries, veiled under various figures and parables, they have made some distinction in this work, although divine, which although it is all equally holy, is not therefore equally intelligible. Therefore, they have thought that the historical books, which represent the lives of the patriarchs, and of the admirable men who had an apostolical charity, so many ages before the apostles, were more proper than others to instruct with example, proportioned to the light which the unlearned faithful usually have. St. Basilus, when reflecting upon this, says, that the Scriptures, in describing the lives of these early saints, place before us so many living and animated pictures for our rule and regulation.

"You will find there admirable examples for kings, for princes, for those who govern states, for ministers of the church, for virgins consecrated to God, and finally for all those who desire to live Christianly in the world, and in the matrimonial state, with which the lives of the saints of the Old Testament have greater agreement; because then, they knew almost no other chastity, excepting the conjugal, and of widowhood; the state of virginity

being reserved for the new law. Therefore, as Pope St. Gregory says, the ancient patriarchs were astonished at any other virtue. Abel, says he, taught innocence; Enoch, purity of heart; Noah, perseverance in justice; Abraham, perfection of obedience; Isaac, chastity in marriage; Jacob, constancy in labour; Joseph, the forgetting of injuries; Moses, mildness towards persons the most contumacious; in fine, Job, invincible patience under a load of afflictions."

With such arguments, the compiler of stories from the Old and New Testament endeavours to satisfy his Italian readers, that such a compilation is much better for them than the real and entire Bible, as it was given by God himself, by the ministry of prophets and apostles. We are told that, for *just reasons*, the Bible, in the vulgar tongue *is forbidden by the Church*. We are told that the saints, who drew up such stories, "perfectly knew the profundity of sacred Scripture;" and, I suppose, they knew also the capacity of every layman's understanding, and how much he was able to receive of the truths contained in the Bible. As I mentioned in a former Number, they took great care that nothing should appear in these stories, or the moral reflections upon them, that could injure the holy mother Church, or teach a sinner the way of salvation by Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. While the book continues to be circulated under the authority of the Church, especially while it is sold *as the Bible*, it will furnish the clearest evidence that the Church of Rome does not generally permit the reading of the holy Scriptures; that, in fact, she withholds the word of God from the people, and, therefore, is both cruel and unjust.

With regard to the translation of the Scriptures into English, we have seen how violently the Pope was enraged against Wickliffe for his undertaking such a work. Had the Pope had his will, the translator and his version of the Bible would have been burnt in the same fire; and, indeed, it was no uncommon thing, previous to Luther's Reformation, to burn heretics with the Bible about their neck. The reading of the Bible was understood almost invariably to produce heresy; and there were many who suffered death for no other crime.

I was about to quote the doctrine of the Rhemish translators, on the subject of giving and withholding the Bible from the common people; but lest it should be thought disrespectful to these doctors to bring them in at the end of a Number, I shall fill up what remains of this sheet with something more modern, though perhaps less venerable.

My great opponent, W. E. ANDREWS, has a correspondent who writes four long letters, in derision of the Bible Society, and against the plan of distributing Bibles, which he declares to be absolutely useless, if not extremely pernicious. He winds up the subject, in his fourth letter, in the following words:—"I would, therefore, suggest to the Bible-men, in order to render their work

complete, to give the Book, when they distribute it, a new title, viz. '*Every man his own parson.*' For, as the general distribution of the Bible must infallibly expose that sacred volume to contempt, abuse, and profanation, in meeting with its tattered contents on the public stall, or in the trunk, I would much rather find it exhibiting the above title, than calling itself the word of God. Our Catholic favourers of the Bible-scheme, I would advise to turn their donations to real charity; and one truly consistent with the principles which they profess, the gratuitous distribution among the poor of *your excellent School Book*, one single reading of which will convey to the minds of the ignorant a knowledge of religion, with which a whole life spent in the reading of the Bible would never furnish them. I mean not to flatter you, Mr. Editor, but I speak from experience and conviction; and I hesitate not to assert, that, if you had published nothing else but your school book, you would be deserving of the praise and encouragement of every member of the true Church of Christ." *O. J.* Vol. ii. p. 142.

Thus Mr. ANDREWS is declared by one of his correspondents to have composed a book much better than the Bible. It imparts, at a single reading, more knowledge of religion than one will gather from the Bible in a whole life. Anxious to see this wonderful book, I sent to London, and procured a copy from the shop of Mr. ANDREWS himself, for the small and easy charge of eighteen pence. On opening the book, the following was among the first things that caught my eye:—"Chapter XII. *Of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.* One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is, devotion to the Blessed Virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it; because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession, in the sight of God, for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation. Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son, Jesus Christ, is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of Mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God has ever created. By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him." &c. &c. There are five pages of such matter; pp. 151—155. Such are the sentiments of the book composed by Mr. ANDREWS, which is said to be so much more useful than the Bible. If religion consists in devotion to the Virgin Mary, no doubt, we may seek in the Bible all our lives, and not find it; but in this book composed by Mr. ANDREWS, (*THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*;) we shall find it in five minutes.

It is vain to expect that Mr. ANDREWS will argue upon Scriptural principles, since, according to the testimony of one of his correspondents, which he prints with great satisfaction, no doubt, in his own Journal, he has composed a book so much better than the Bible, as to render the use of it quite unnecessary. To add weight to the testimony of the above correspondent, the Rev. Dr. MILNER, Vicar Apostolic, declares, in a letter of recommendation prefixed to the work, that it is by far the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXXII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20th, 1819.

AT the conclusion of my last number, I quoted the words of a modern Papist, who declares that Mr. ANDREWS, the Catholic Vindicator, and Editor of the Orthodox Journal, had written a book much better than the Bible; a book, one reading of which, he says, will impart more knowledge of religion than could be gathered from the Bible in a whole life: and the author himself seems to acquiesce in the opinion of his correspondent, as he prints the panegyric in his Journal, without so much as a modest hint, that his friend had praised his work too highly.

In the opinion of modern Papists, the Bible is a very useless, and a very dangerous book. Some of them endeavoured to conceal, but others very plainly avow this opinion. Of the latter, is the correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, above referred to, and so far as appears, of the Journalist himself. On this subject, it must be allowed, they have deviated less from the doctrine of their fathers than on some other points. I must not be understood to mean that they have in any respect deviated from the ancient doctrine of their church; but merely that their language with regard to the Bible, and the danger of reading it, is more like the language of their fathers, than their modern professions are with regard to other doctrines, such as the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, which, though generally held at one time, is now generally disavowed. In short, it seems to have been a doctrine universally maintained in the church for ages, and it is still publicly maintained by Papists, that the reading of the Bible, by the people indiscriminately, is to be deprecated as a most dangerous thing.

Under this impression the Rhemish translators went to work. They were grieved to see that Protestant translators were giving the people in England the Bible in their own language, some of them without note or comment. They, being mostly English Papists, who were obliged to leave the country in the reign of Elizabeth, settled at Rheims: and there they undertook to give an English version of the Scriptures for the use of their

countrymen, with such a load of notes and annotations, as would both make it a costly book, and prevent as much as possible the people from gathering any thing like heresy out of it. They begin their preface in the following manner. Let it be observed, it is only of the New Testament they are speaking, for they say they had not the means of printing the whole Bible, though the whole would have been published at less expense by itself alone, than their New Testament with its cumberous notes.

“ The Holy Bible, long since translated by us into English, and the Old Testament lying by us for lack of good means to publish the whole, in such sort as a work of so great charge and importance requireth: we have yet, through God’s goodness, at length fully finished for thee (most Christian reader,) **ALL THE NEW TESTAMENT**, which is the principal, most profitable, and comfortable piece of holy writ: and as well for all other institutions of life and doctrine, as especially for deciding the doubts of these days, more proper and pregnant, than the other part not yet printed.

“ Which translation we do not, for all that, publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God, to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them in a known language: pernicious and much hurtful to many: or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God’s word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical learned languages: not for these, nor any such like causes, do we translate this sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which divers things are either necessary, or profitable and medicinable now, that, otherwise, in the peace of the church, were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable.”

If we translate this into plain modern English, the meaning will be found to be, that it is not necessary to have the Bible in the mother tongue of any country; that it was not ordained by God to be read by the vulgar; that the reading of it is often very hurtful; that it was not requisite, or even tolerable to have the Bible in the vulgar tongue during the time of the church’s peace, that is, before the Reformation; and the grave doctors consent to give a version in English now, merely because, if they will not, some other will; and if they do not give a version well fenced with notes and annotations, the people will be in danger of getting it without any such safeguard. The doctors proceed:—

“ In this matter, to mark only the wisdom and moderation of holy church and the governors thereof on the one side, and the

indiscreet zeal of the popular and their factious leaders, on the other, is a high point of prudence. These latter, partly of simplicity, partly of curiosity, and specially of pride and disobedience, have made claim in this case for the common people, with plausible pretences many, but good reasons none at all. The other, to whom Christ hath given charge of our souls, the dispensing of God's mysteries and treasures, (among which holy Scripture is no small store) and the feeding his family in season with food fit for every sort, have neither of old, nor of late, ever wholly condemned all vulgar versions of Scripture, nor have at any time generally forbidden the faithful to read the same; yet they have not by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended, any such interpretation to be indifferently used of all men."

Here we learn that those who plead on behalf of the people, that they may have the word of God in their own language, do it of simplicity, curiosity, and specially of pride and disobedience; and though they make many plausible pretences, can give no good reasons at all why the people should be allowed to read the word of God. We learn farther, that the church did not condemn all vulgar versions, or forbid the faithful to read the same; that is, she did not condemn, or forbid the people to read what did not exist: and it is admitted, that the church never so much as recommended the Scriptures to be read generally by the people. It would be more like the truth to say, that she did not think it proper, or consistent with her own safety, to give the people a translation of the Scriptures. In the following paragraph the learned doctors speak more plainly:—

"Now since Luther's revolt also, divers learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolishing a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclaim of many good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in the several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin church: no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the Scriptures, poisoning the people under colour of divine authority, and not many other remedies being more sovereign against the same (if it be used in order, discretion, and humility) than the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed thereunto."

The translators cite the authority of the Council of Trent, and regret that in their days the law, as ordained by that council, could not in all cases be observed; that is, they found it impossible to enforce the law against perverse and presumptuous readers of the Bible. They speak with exultation of those happy times when "the scholar taught not his master the sheep controuled not the

husbandman, artificer, prentice, boys, girls, mystress, maid, man:”—Then the holy Scriptures were not “sung, played, alledged, of every tinker, taverner, rhymmer, minstrel;” “they were not for table talk, for ale-benches, for boats and barges, and for every profane person and company. No; in those *better times* men were neither so ill, nor so curious of themselves, so to abuse the blessed book of Christ: neither was there such easy means, before printing was invented, to disperse the copies into the hand of every man, as there is now.” See the *Preface to the Rhemish Translation of the New Testament*.

Certainly, in Popish estimation, these must have been happy times, when the priests held the key of knowledge in their own hands; and when nobody, without their permission, durst look into the word of God. When there was little danger of the people falling into heresy, the priests taught and did what they pleased; and this would probably have been the case to this day, had not such men as Wickliffe and Luther, by translating the Bible into the language of the common people, generously put the key into their hands, that they might search the Scriptures and judge for themselves.

When the Rhemish doctors were giving a translation of the Bible into English, and speaking so strongly of the great evil and danger of its being universally read, one is apt to wonder what comment they would give on such passages as these: “Search the Scriptures,” (John v. 39.) and “these were more noble than those of Thessalonica, for they searched the Scriptures daily,” &c. (Acts xvii. 11.) On John v. 39. they have the following marginal note:—“Catholics search the Scriptures, and find there Peter’s and his successors’ primacy, the real presence, priests power to forgive sins, justification by faith and good works, virginity preferred before matrimony, breach of the vow of continency damnable, voluntary poverty, penance, alms, and good deeds meritorious, divers rewards in heaven according to divers merits, and such like.” And upon the same verse they have the following annotation:—“He reprehendeth the Jews, that reading daily the Scriptures, and acknowledging that in them they should find life and salvation, they yet looked over them so superficially that they could not find therein him to be Christ, their King, Lord, Life, and Saviour. For the special masters and scribes of the Jews then, were like unto our heretics now, who be ever talking, and turning, and shuffling the Scriptures, but are of all men most ignorant of the deep knowledge thereof. And, therefore, our Master referreth them not to the reading only, or learning them without book, or having the sentences thereof gloriously painted or written in their temple, houses, or cotes; but to the deep search of the meaning and mysteries of the Scriptures, which are not so easily to be seen in the letter.” By such unin-

telligible jargon the grave doctors attempt to set aside the divine command to search the Scriptures.

They are not more successful in their annotation on Acts xvii. 11. They say, "The heretics use this place to prove that the hearers must try and judge by the Scriptures, whether their teachers and preachers' doctrine be true, and so reject what they find not in the Scriptures, as though here the sheep were made judges of their pastors, the people of their priests, and men and women of all sorts, even of St. Paul's doctrine itself; which were the most foolish doctrine in the world." It may appear to Popish priests a very foolish thing, that the people should judge of their doctrine, and try it by the standard of Scripture; but the inspired writer of the Acts of the Apostles has left on record an honourable testimony on behalf of the Bereans, that they did the very thing which the priests would reckon so foolish and disorderly; and however much the teachers of error may dread the practice of trying their doctrine by the Bible, I can imagine nothing more delightful to a teacher of the truth, than to know that his hearers can, and that they do make it their business to examine and prove all that he inculcates, by that unerring standard. Faithful ministers have nothing of their own to inculcate. Their business is to publish the very truth which they find in the Bible, and nothing else; and should they, at any time, mistake the meaning of a passage, a circumstance which may happen with persons who lay no claim to infallibility, instead of being offended, they would be much indebted to any one of their flock who might set them right. Popish priests look upon the common people as the dust beneath their feet, to whom no degree of respect or consideration is due; but the evangelical pastor of a Christian congregation looks upon his people as his brethren and his equals, who, though they have not the official oversight of the flock with which he is honoured, and may not have had the same advantages of education, yet, having the word of God in their hands, and daily access to the throne of grace, by prayer, for the understanding of it, may, by the divine blessing, come to such a knowledge of its contents, as to be able, in some cases, to instruct their teachers, especially such of them as are young, and have but recently entered upon the work of the ministry. In point of fact, I know that this has been the case; and what minister of Christ would not glory in having such persons among his flock, instead of complaining of them as an insufferable nuisance? This is however, incomprehensible by a Papist. With him the priest is every thing, and the people are nothing. The priest may utter from the pulpit the grossest nonsense; and the people dare not judge of it, or call in question the truth of what they hear. This would involve the absurdity of the sheep judging their pastor: and the use of this similitude, which is brought forward oftener than once by the Rhemish translators, seems intended

to impress upon the people the idea that they are as much inferior to their priests as sheep are to their shepherds.

In short, it seems to have been the design of these translators, even when they were presenting to their countrymen the New Testament in English, to impress them with an idea that they would have been much safer without it: and that they would act the part of wise men by meddling as little with it as possible. The translators cannot conceal their apprehension that the word of God in English will do mischief; but they have done every thing in their power to prevent this, by mixing up with it a copious quantity of their own stuff, in the form of notes and annotations, which are calculated, as much as the traditions of the elders were, to make the word of God of none effect. Indeed, these Rhemish doctors have proved themselves genuine descendants of the Jewish priests, of whom the Lord by his prophet complained, that instead of dispensing his word as living water, pure from the source, they had rendered it muddy by their corrupt mixtures. "Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but you must foul the residue with your feet? And as for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden with your feet; and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet." Ezek. xxxiv. 18, 19.

Now, as I said at the beginning of this Number, there is less difference between the language of ancient and modern Papists on this subject than on some others. Whatever Mr. SCOTT, who resides in Glasgow, where it would be very unpopular to speak against the circulation of the Bible, may please to say or write upon the subject, his brethren in other places, at this very day, write against the circulation of the Scriptures as plainly as any Papist could have done four hundred years ago; and the Pope lately issued a bull against Bible Societies, of which I may give a copy in my next Number. The following is the doctrine of the Orthodox Journal, as declared by a correspondent, and not objected to by the Editor, or any other correspondent; from which I infer it is the doctrine of English Papists in general, especially as the Editor tells me, that in his church, the faith of one is the faith of all. (*See Catholic Vindicator*, p. 1.)

The writer says, I shall "conclude my present (letter) with lamenting that the characteristic spirit of my country, a spirit of charity and benevolence, should evaporate in such airy schemes, as the attempt to propagate Christianity by the mere distributing of the Bible among people, of whom not one half can read at all, and of those who can read, each is to be allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense he pleases. Time was, Mr. Editor, but it was when the genuine form of Christianity, as introduced by its first Apostles, flourished in the land, when the

charity of our truly pious ancestors, receiving its proper direction from *religion*, excited the admiration of surrounding nations by the magnificent and heaven-inspiring edifices which it erected for the celebration of the worship of the Most High, by the countless foundations which it instituted for the promotion of piety, and by its innumerable receptacles for the distressed of all conditions, which, while they afforded relief to the body, provided much more effectually for the soul the kind aids and comforts of religion, to prepare her for future bliss. May heaven grant those days may yet return?" *O. J.* Vol. II. p. 98.

I invite this writer to come to Glasgow, and he will witness the accomplishment of his prayer. Such days have actually returned in our city. Papists have expended, it is said, fifteen thousand pounds in erecting a "heaven-inspiring" edifice; and I question if ever they expended fifteen hundred pence in distributing the Bible. Their charity has not evaporated in such "airy schemes," as giving the people the word of God. In the New Testament, we read nothing of "heaven-inspiring edifices," nor of any sort of material buildings, as at all connected with the glory of the gospel church; but in the opinion of Papists, whose religion is not derived from the New Testament, but from ancient Heathenism, the building of splendid edifices is looked upon as a much more pious work than the distribution of the holy Scriptures. Let it be observed, this is not merely the opinion of ancient doctors of the church; it is publicly avowed in the *Orthodox Journal* as lately as 1814.

The writer ought to have known, that it is no part of the Bible Society's plan to give the holy Scriptures to those who cannot read; but only to those who can; and though it is no part of its plan, as a society, to promote the education of the poor in the art of reading, yet, in point of fact, most of its members have become in one way or other extremely active in the work of education. The necessity of distributing the Bible for the salvation of sinners, suggested the necessity of teaching the poor to read; and societies upon an extensive scale have been formed for the purpose. These, so far as they relate to the teaching of poor Papists, are as great an eye-sore to Popish writers as the Bible Society itself, of which I have abundant evidence before me, in some virulent letters in the *Orthodox Journal*, against the Hibernian Society, whose object it is to teach the art of reading to all the poor in Ireland.

To the insinuation of the correspondent of the *Orthodox Journal*, that each of those who read the Bible is "allowed to twist the sacred letter to what ever sense or nonsense he pleases," I have only to reply that I know no power on earth that has a right to hinder him, if he be so wickedly inclined. The word of God is addressed to sinners with sufficient evidence, and sufficient plainness; and if, through prejudice, or any corrupt bias of the

heart, men choose to pervert it, and twist it to a meaning which it does not convey, they must answer for their wickedness, not to man, but to God. He reserves the judgment in this case to himself; and though he authorizes all his churches to put away from them those who so pervert his word, if any such should arise among them, yet he has given no man, or body of men on earth, the power either to allow or prevent the free exercise of private judgment. If persons would bring to the perusal of the Bible an unbiassed mind, they would find it the plainest book in the world. Every thing that relates to the way of salvation, that is, every thing of primary importance, is perfectly level to the capacity of a child; and if persons will pervert, and twist to a false meaning, what is so plain and simple, they must answer to God for their folly. Fellow creatures have no right to hinder them. Christians pity them, and pray for them, and would gladly reclaim them, even at the expense of suffering the scorn and contempt of the objects of their pity; but they have no right to use coercion.

If it were not so that all men, in this free country, were allowed the exercise of private judgment; if they were not even allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense they pleased, Papists would not be allowed to hold, much less to publish their nonsense; for of all the sects in existence, none exhibit such a monstrous mass of nonsense as the Church of Rome does; and it is nonsense founded partly upon the twisting and perversion of many plain texts of Scripture, of which numerous examples could be given from the Rhemish notes and annotations.

From this writer, however, I learn that if his party had the upper hand in this country, they would not allow persons to twist and turn the letter of Scripture to any sense or nonsense they pleased: that is, in plain English, they would not allow the right of private judgment. They would withhold the Bible altogether, as their fathers did, if they could, and if they could not, they would give it with an authoritative interpretation, with a command, under severe penalties, not to derive any other meaning from the sacred word than what they chose to impose upon it. This is not the doctrine of any one writer; it pervades the writings of all Papists ancient and modern. Even *AMICUS VERITATIS* (see Part I. p. 44.) speaks of "private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and in all matters of religion," as if it were the fruitful source of anarchy, rebellion, and every evil; from which it is plain, that if he had the power in his hands, he would allow none to believe but as the church believed.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXXIII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27th, 1819.

THE circulation of the holy Scriptures has, of late years, engaged a great deal of public attention. Since the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the subject has become popular. Christians of all denominations have been aroused from their lethargy; and they have begun to wonder at the supineness of their fathers, and of themselves, with regard to an object to which the heart of every Christian ought to be feelingly alive. If the Bible be the word of God, addressed to sinners, for the purpose of showing sinners the way of salvation, every Christian who reflected on the subject, must have felt ashamed that he had made no effort, at least that he had done so little, in order to promote the circulation of the divine word throughout the world. When the subject was brought distinctly before the eyes of our Christian population, all seemed to be impressed by a sense of its importance; and the voluntary contributions of thousands showed that the impression had not been made in vain.

But how did the Popish part of our population feel on this occasion? It has been proved that, according to the ancient doctrine of their church, it was not proper or safe to allow the universal circulation, and indiscriminate reading, of the word of God: it has been shewn, that the holy council of Trent solemnly declared that it was manifest by experience, that this did more harm than good. How then could those priests of the Romish church, who had sworn to adhere to all the canons of that council, fall in with the current of public opinion, and consent to the free circulation of the Scriptures among their people? Indeed this was a difficult and a delicate matter. Mr. Scott, however, attempted to get over the difficulty, by publicly declaring, that it never was a doctrine or principle of the Church of Rome, to withhold the Bible from the laity; and I must do him the justice to say, that he applied for, and received from the Society, a number of English Bibles, to be distributed among the poor of his communion.

Several Protestant gentlemen in London had formed a plan for printing and dispersing the holy Scriptures in those

English versions which are approved by the Church of Rome ; and they were encouraged by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Romish priest in that city, who declared, on behalf of himself and brethren, that they would be ready to circulate the Bible in English among their people, if any society would give them their own version. Papists make many unreasonable objections to our authorized version of the Scriptures ; and they accuse our translators of wilful perversion of the meaning of many passages, while, in point of fact, there is no great difference between their translation and ours, of those passages which relate most immediately to the way of salvation. Their own Douay Bible, and Rhemish Testament, both of which I have been consulting, declare very explicitly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ ; and I think they would not lead to any fatal error *, were they disencumbered of the absurd notes and annotations, which are hung as a dead weight upon them.

The following are the words of the priest above referred to, in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Marsh : “ If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible, by presenting us some copies of a Catholic version, *with* or *without* notes, we will gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute them.”

A sum of money was subscribed, and plans were taken into consideration, for printing and circulating gratuitously, or at a small price, those Bibles in English which the priests professed to approve ; and the gentlemen associated for the purpose were so simple as to expect that the priests would concur with them, seeing it had been publicly declared, that they would gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute copies of their own version, if any of the Bible Societies would put it in their power. The event, however, showed that they would do no such thing. When the proposal was made by a body of Protestants, to supply the poor of the Romish Church with their own version of the Bible, *without* notes, the very priest who had publicly declared his readiness to further the plan, resisted the execution of it.

This led to a long correspondence, which has been printed, and very extensively circulated, under the title of “ Correspondence on the formation, objects, and plan, of the Roman Catholic Bible Society,” &c. 1813. I need not give large extracts from this work, as it is pretty generally known. It shows clearly, that the Reverend Gentleman, though he wished to make a parade of his regard for the Bible, and his willingness to assist in dispersing it, while the subject was popular, had yet no real intention of doing so. When his offer was embraced, and Protestants were about to

* I must be understood to except their translation of Heb. xi. 21. which represents Jacob as an idolater at the hour of his death. He “ adored the top of his rod,” say the Rhemists ;—He “ worshipped the top of his rod,” say the Douay doctors : meaning, as they say in a note, the top of Joseph’s sceptre, as to a figure of Christ’s sceptre and kingdom.

give him copies of the New Testament, in his own approved version, he found out, or "he feared it would oppose a *principle* of his church, if Catholics were to print the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue without notes; and that they could not allow the English Bible without them, because ignorant persons would misinterpret certain important texts, unaccompanied by explanations."

Mr. Gandolphy was asked, "whether the New Testament, which Protestants meant to reprint without notes, provided it were done faithfully from the Rhemish version, would be generally acceptable to the Catholic people? He answered, that himself and several other clergymen would put some copies in circulation; though he could not say they would be universally acceptable, as it was not a Catholic principle to recommend the Scriptures without such explanations. Moreover, the English Catholic Board did not now intend to disperse *gratuitously*, even their own stereotype edition, *with notes*; for they could not go about to desire people to receive Testaments, '*because the Catholics did not in any wise consider the Scriptures necessary.*' He said, they learnt and taught *their* religion by means of catechisms and elementary tracts." pp. 12, 13.

"Mr. Gandolphy was positive that the Catholic clergy would not relax a single principle which had always been in exercise to this time; that they would never put the English Scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant; nor yet give the Bible gratuitously, even *with notes*, to every body who applied for it, but only under the direction and at the will of their superiors." p. 14.

Thus it appears very plainly, that Popish priests in England, at this very day, dare not trust their common people with the word of God, even as translated into English by themselves, without safeguards of their own creation, to prevent the people from finding in it a meaning unfavourable to their fundamental principles. It would be a libel upon the work of any human author, to say that he had written so equivocally, and expressed himself so unhappily, upon subjects interesting in the highest degree to every man and woman, that no one could read his work without great danger, and almost a certainty of imbibing fatal errors. Yet, in this manner do Papists every day libel the book of God. In short, they cannot trust the Almighty with direct communication with his own creatures. While He speaks in his word, they stand by, and claim to have at least word about with him, lest, without their interference, his word would do mischief. Nay, such is the awful presumption and impiety of these priests, that when the Almighty is about to speak to sinners by the Bible, they step forward and say, "Hear us first." Nothing less than this is implied in their guarding and fencing the Bible, by their pernicious prefaces, notes, and annotations, especially as they will not suffer it to speak without these safeguards.

This, of itself, ought to convince the reader that there is, with the Romish priests, a consciousness that the Bible is against them

The Bible is an impartial witness for the truth. The priests will not allow it to speak but through them; the inference is unavoidable,—they are afraid it would speak against them.

Popish writers speak with great reverence of the Bible, as it is locked up in the learned languages, but when it appears in the vulgar language of any country, and when it becomes the study of the common people, then they speak of it as the most pernicious book in the world. Their affected respect for the word of God, and their real abhorrence of it, are more offensive than the sneers of the grossest infidels, just as the "Hail Master!" of Judas was more disgusting than the "Away with him—crucify him!" of the Pharisees and the profane rabble.

The following are the sentiments of another modern Papist on this subject:—"If the promiscuous reading of the Scriptures be calculated to produce any effect, it is to scatter the seeds of religious discord and frenzy, to give birth to new species of Methodists, and to fill the world with scriptural maniacs. Were the sacred volumes clear and intelligible to every one; were it impossible to mistake their meaning, the Rev. and Right Rev. Patrons of Bible Societies would merit well of Christianity. But as long as they are difficult to be understood; as long as they treat of subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, the sacred text will be wrested by the vulgar to their own perdition, unless a pillar of light go before them to direct their steps through the dark mazes of Biblical erudition. Ignorance is generally self-sufficient; and we cannot be surprized, that the most illiterate plebeian should imagine himself capable of understanding the sacred writings. Let him but once form this notion (and what Dissenter has not already formed it?) and then farewell to the tenets of the Established Church. I have somewhere read a story of a Dutch Calvinist, who, like an English Protestant, thought herself capable of understanding the word of God contained in her Bible. It happened that this Biblical Lady was in company with an English priest, and the conversation turning on religion, she grew warm. During the course of their polemical disquisitions, the priest asserted the insufficiency of Scripture, as a rule of faith: his female antagonist, anxious for the integrity of her fundamental principle, boldly asserted the contrary; and, with more zeal perhaps than prudence, defied her sacerdotal adversary to point out a passage which she could not expound. To try her scriptural abilities, he fixed on the 14th verse of the xlii. chapter of Ecclesiasticus, "*Better is the iniquity of a man, than the good works of a woman,*" and desired her to explain it. After waiting some time, in hopes of being visited by the Holy Spirit, she found it impossible to solve the difficulty. At length growing impatient of defeat, and ashamed of being unable to defend herself and her sex, from the apparently harsh and ungentle reflection of the sacred penman, she threw herself headlong into the canal, and it was with considerable

difficulty that the watermen rescued her ladyship from an untimely grave." *Orthodox Journal*, Vol. III. p. 355.

The above, I suppose, is intended to exhibit a specimen of Popish wit, at the expense of the Bible, which is said to treat of "subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities," and which, it is taken for granted, are not clear and intelligible to every one. But if the Bible contains only matter which does not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, it must be as much beyond the capacity of the priest as of the plebeian, for the priests have not yet proved that their capacities are unlimited; and if the Bible be not clear and intelligible to *every* one, it is not so to *any* one; and therefore the Popish argument goes to set aside the authority of the Bible altogether. Papists would act more like honest men, by avowing this to be their object, than by affecting great respect for the Bible, while they are labouring to undermine its authority.

As for the story of the Dutch lady, I shall not call it a forgery, though many things, a thousand times better authenticated, are called forgeries by my Popish opponents. Supposing it to be a true story, I am far from praising her boldness, and confidence in her own theological knowledge; for while I maintain that such parts of the Bible as relate directly to the salvation of sinners are level to the capacity of a child, I must allow that there are some things not easily understood, particularly prophecies not yet accomplished, and of which the priests are as ignorant as the meanest of their people. But it is unfortunate for the argument of the writer on whose letter I am animadverting, that the passage of which he made choice to try the lady's knowledge of the Bible, is not in the Bible; and it is also a little unfavourable to the credit of his story, that the lady should not have known this. There is certainly no such assertion in the Bible, and there is nothing in sentiment that borders upon it, that the "iniquity of a man is better than the good works of a woman;" and I cannot imagine any object which the writer could have in view, but to bring the Bible into contempt, by palming such a sentiment upon it. The Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, in a religious point of view, has no more authority than the *Orthodox Journal*; and therefore I have nothing to do with the sentiments contained in it; yet, if the reader will look into the passage as in our English version, he will see that it does not express the meaning above ascribed to it.

In short, it is now, as it has always been, that Papists hate the Bible; they look upon it as their enemy, and they cannot conceal their hostility against it. That this is the case, not merely with a few obscure individuals, but with the very Head of the church himself, will appear by the following Bull issued by the present Pope against Bible Societies, in which, it will be seen, he refers to the authority of the council of Trent, and pleads this as a reason for refusing the people in general the Bible in their own

language, except under such limitations as would effectually deprive the people of the free use of the sacred volume.

Translation of the Bull against Bible Societies. Issued June 29th, 1816, by Pope Pius VII. to the Archbishop of Gnesn, Primate of Poland. Pius P. P. VII.

“Venerable Brother,—Health and apostolic benediction.

“In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours; in which you have appealed to this Holy See, in the name of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called Bible Societies, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns have so pressed upon us, on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitation.

“We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in Council with our venerable Brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our Pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence, as far as possible. In the meantime, we heartily congratulate you, venerable Brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the Apostolic See, this defilement of the faith, so imminently dangerous to souls. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

“With this view, we issue the present Brief, viz. that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence. For the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans, which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion; whence it becomes an Episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, “that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other pro-

hibited books, conformably to the Rules of the Index (§. Nos. 2 and 3.); for it is evident, from experience, that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit," (Rule IV.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary Decree of the Congregation of the Index (June 13th, 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the Apostolic See, or published with Annotations extracted from the Writings of holy fathers of the Church.

"We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the Faith, we congratulate in the Lord, trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

"It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us, as soon as possible, the Bible which Jacob Wulek published in the Polish language with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations, taken from the writings of the holy fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair, for the preservation of the true faith.

"Continue, therefore, venerable Brother, to pursue this truly pious course upon which you have entered; viz. diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares, which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may, by this cheering hope, be somewhat alleviated: and, we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow Bishops, for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our Apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29, 1816, the 17th year of our Pontificate.

PIUS P. P. VII."

It will be observed that this Bull relates to Poland, a country still enveloped by the grossest darkness of Popery. Attempts had been made to introduce the word of God into that benighted region, by means of a Bible Society; and I believe the attempt

has partly succeeded, under the auspices of the Emperor of Russia; but the above shows how much the supreme authority of the Church of Rome was opposed to the measure. As a late writer has observed, a council of bats and owls will naturally vote against the light, so it seems the supreme head of the Romish church, with his cardinals and clergy, are decidedly against the people in Poland receiving the holy Scriptures, which are a light to the feet, and a lamp to the path of all that read and believe what they contain, unless this light shall be allowed to shine only through the dense atmosphere which they would throw around it. "No versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue," says his Holiness, "must be permitted, except such as are approved by the Apostolic See, or published with Annotations extracted from the writings of holy fathers of the church."

Now, the Bible stands by divine appointment as a witness for God, between the people and those who profess to teach them. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isa. viii. 20. This was a rule which God gave to his people, by which they might try those who professed to have even the gift of prophecy: by this rule the people of Berea tried the preaching of the Apostles, and they are praised by the inspired penman for what they did. By this rule, therefore, every man is authorised, nay, he is commanded to try the doctrine of any church, or of any individual, who may address him on subjects of divine revelation. To the law and to the testimony;—does this doctrine agree with the word of God? Is it according to the testimony of the faithful Witness?

Persons conscious of innocence and integrity, if brought to trial before any tribunal, wish above all things to have the plain unbiassed testimony of faithful honest witnesses. But, if I saw a person brought to trial before a court of justice, who would not allow a witness to speak in his own plain way, but would insist on his testimony being received, through the medium of himself, or his counsel, with such glosses and explanations as they chose to give; I would form a verdict in my own mind, which would be confirmed by any jury in the kingdom, that the pannel was guilty of something which he wished to conceal.

This is precisely the predicament in which the Church of Rome is placed. She is brought to the trial of public opinion. The Bible is the witness by whose testimony she must stand or fall. But she will not suffer the witness to speak, except through the medium of herself; she will not allow the words of the witness to have any meaning but such as she chooses to give them. She is therefore without further evidence convicted;—she has departed from the doctrine of the Bible, and set up her own authority, in opposition to the authority of God.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXXIV.

SATURDAY, MARCH 6th, 1819.

I WISH some Popish author would inform me what evil the Bible has done. The Council of Trent has solemnly declared, that if it be permitted to be read every where, or by all, it does more harm than good; and this, they say, is manifest by experience. The present Pope, in the bull which I gave in my last Number, quotes the words of the said Council, and upon this high authority, he condemns Bible Societies, and prohibits the circulation of the Scriptures among the common people in their own language, because it is manifest by experience, that the reading of the Bible, by all indiscriminately, does more harm than good. Both the Pope and the Council, however, satisfy themselves with a general sweeping sentence of condemnation. They enter into no particulars. They do not mention the nature or extent of the evil. The Bible must by all means be proscribed; but the Romish priests are as silent as the enemies of Christ were, when it was asked, "Why, what evil hath he done?"

Experience is generally allowed to be a competent, a credible, and an intelligible witness. If, then, the holy Council of Trent, or his Holiness the present Pope, had brought forward this witness, and allowed him to speak for himself; in other words, had they produced a series of undoubted, or well authenticated, historical facts to substantiate their accusation of the Bible, we would have been able to form a better judgment with regard to the truth of their unqualified assertion. But nothing of the kind is attempted. Neither the Pope nor the Council have facts to show,—at least that they choose to show.

The apostle Paul tells us, that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and that it is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work; nay, he says, it is able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All the inspired penmen,—more properly the Holy Spirit, who guided the pen of every one of them,—bear witness that the word of God contained in the Bible, is calculated to give understanding to the simple, to impart knowledge, life,

and salvation to the most wretched of the human race. But, no, says the present Pope of Rome ; no, say the holy fathers of the Council of Trent ; it is manifest by experience, that the Bible does more harm than good, if it be permitted to be read every where without difference.

Let the Church of Rome be tried upon this ground alone, and she will be found to be the Antichrist that was foretold by prophets and apostles ;—that malignant, idolatrous power that should exalt itself above the authority of God. It was the will of God, when he gave his word to men by the ministry of his servants, that it should be made known to all the world ; but the Church of Rome, having, by means of cunning and falsehood, obtained an ascendancy over other churches, and having prevailed upon them to submit to her usurpation, laid hold of the sacred word, by which this usurpation, and her other tricks, were unequivocally condemned, and locked it up from the view of vulgar eyes. Thenceforward, it was to be seen and read only by the initiated ; that is, by those who had acquired an interest in its concealment ; and who readily joined in the conspiracy of their predecessors to keep it from the view of all the world besides. Thus the word of God was concealed. The light was put under a bushel. Countries in which the light of the gospel had shone for a time, became, no less than the heathen world, a land of darkness and of the shadow of death, and where even the light was as darkness.

I know that the Church of Rome endeavours to clear herself of this wickedness, by openly maintaining, that the Scriptures were not meant to be given to all men in their own language, but only to the church ; and, by a strange perversion of language, they make the word *church* to signify the clergy. The priests thus place themselves between God and the common people. They say, they alone are commissioned to tell the people, by word of mouth, what God tells them in the Bible. They say, the *church* (still meaning the clergy,) has power and authority to declare what is the true meaning of the divine word ; that Christ has promised to be with his church (that is, the clergy) to the end of the world ; that therefore they cannot err in their exposition of Scripture : whereas the people themselves would almost certainly imbibe error, if they were to read the Bible without the glosses of such infallible interpreters. This doctrine is plainly avowed by Popish writers of the present day, particularly by the Editor of the *Orthodox Journal* and his correspondents ; and by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Popish priest in London. Though, therefore, they should deny every historical fact, and call every quotation from every ancient book a forgery, I am ready to meet them, and to prove them antichristian out of their own mouths, and by their own pens. Though every intelligent reader knows that all history is against the Church of Rome on this point ; that the writings of fathers, and the canons of councils, prove her

guilty ; yet I am willing to give up all these in the present instance ; and I engage to show from the testimony of living Papists, that their religion is hostile to the free circulation of the word of God ; and is, therefore, opposed to the authority of God.

The first thing to be established is, that God requires his word, as contained in the Bible, to be universally published, and universally read. I am not called at present to prove the divine authority of the holy Scriptures, or any part of them. I am not reasoning with professed infidels ; but with persons who profess to receive every part of the inspired canon. They very foolishly, indeed, profess to receive as inspired some Apocryphal books, upon no higher authority than the Council of Trent ;* but so far as I know, they reject none of the inspired writings acknowledged by Protestants. From the writings, therefore, which they themselves acknowledge, but which they have studiously concealed from the vulgar, I endeavour to prove that God requires his word to be published to the whole world.

I rest my argument on the first section of the seventy-eighth Psalm ; and that my Popish readers may have no apology for rejecting its authority, I shall give it in their own Douay translation. I know that they would reject our Protestant translation, though there was not a shade of difference in the meaning. Following the Vulgate, they call it Psalm lxxvii. though it is added, the same line, *Heb.* lxxviii. Verses 1—8. are as follow :—

“ Attend, O my people, to my law, incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in parables : I will utter propositions from the beginning. How great things have we heard and known, and our fathers have told us. They have not been hid from their children, in another generation. Declaring the praises of the Lord, and his powers, and his wonders which he hath done. And he set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel. How great things he commanded our fathers, that they should make the same known to their children : that another generation might know them. The children that should be born, and should rise up, and declare them to their children. That they may put their hope in God, and may not forget the works of God ; and may seek his commandments. That they may not become like their fathers, a perverse and exasperating generation. A generation that set not their heart right ; and whose spirit was not faithful to God.” They have no annotations on this passage, except one on verse second, which is as follows :—“ *Propositions.* Deep and mysterious sayings. By this it appears that the historical facts of ancient times, commemorated in this Psalm, were deep and *mysterious* ; as being figures of great truths appertaining to the time of the New Testament.”

* The reader will find some interesting information on the subject of the Apocryphal books, in the two first Numbers of the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor* for the present year.

Now this Psalm bears on the very face of it, to be an address by the God of Israel to his *people*. It is not a private message to the priests ; but a public proclamation to the whole nation, or church of Israel, introduced with a solemn note of attention ;—“ Attend, O my people !” This proclamation sets forth the following important facts, that God set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel ; that he *commanded the fathers to make the same known to their children* ; and they again to their children, throughout all generations. The testimony and the law, denote the whole of divine revelation, particularly the Scriptures of the Old Testament, (Isa. viii. 16, and 20.) It is not merely the system of legal observances, ordained according to the law of Moses, but the divine testimony concerning the Saviour promised of old, whose work of atoning and sanctifying, was shadowed forth, or typically represented, by the Mosaic rites. This is evident from what is declared to be the design of setting up the testimony in Jacob, and making the law in Israel, which was, that *they might put their hope in God* ; which no sinner was ever required to do upon the footing of the law, but solely upon the ground of that righteousness, which was the subject of the testimony.

Now, the command of God is distinct and explicit, that this testimony and law should be made known by the fathers to their children ; and not to their children only, but also to the strangers or foreigners who should reside among them, (see Num. xv. 26. Deut. xxix. 11. Isa. lvi. 3, 6.) There is no exception made on account of the dulness of the apprehension of children, or the prejudices of strangers. Call the subjects of the testimony and of the law, “propositions,” or “deep mysteries,” or what you will, they are evidently things which fathers could teach, and which children could learn. They are things with which both parents and children were required to be so familiar, that they should talk of them when they lay down, and when they rose up, when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way, (Deut. vi. 7.)

It is no less evident that the Scriptures of the New Testament were ordained to be published to all the world. These declare the accomplishment of what was predicted and typically represented in the Old Testament ; and what is thus accomplished, is, by the *commandment* of the everlasting God, *made known to all nations* for the obedience of faith. Still there is no account made of the weakness of the minds of children, or of the prejudices of education, or of the danger of misinterpreting the word of God. It is declared of Timothy, that from a child he had known the holy Scriptures ; those of the Old Testament are no doubt meant he had learned them from the reading of his mother and grandmother ; and Christ himself declares, concerning the things of his kingdom, that is, the subjects contained in the New Testament, that, though hid from the wise and prudent, they were revealed unto babes. They were subjects level to the capacity of children, and to such they were actually made known.

In short, there is nothing that appears more clearly in the Bible, than that it is addressed to all, and that it ought to be accessible to all. The command of God was to Jacob or Israel, (for the words are used indifferently for the church of God,) to make known the testimony and the law; that is, not only to publish it, but to teach it diligently. Every father in Israel was commanded to teach it to his children. This supposes that every family had access to it, in a language which they understood. The same thing applies to the Scriptures of the New Testament, for they were written for the purpose of being made publicly known. We read much of the benefit which results from a knowledge of the word of God,—of its dwelling in us richly,—of being filled with the knowledge of his will, and of making the holy Scriptures the subject of our daily meditation. But no where do we read in the Bible, that the word of God does mischief; that the reading of it is dangerous; and that it ought to be kept from the common people.

Thus, I think, it appears evidently the will of God, that the Bible should be published to all the world; and that it should be accessible to all men. But the Council of Trent has decreed otherwise, as the Council of Thoulouse did before it. These bodies were in effect the same as the Church of Rome. They acted in name of the whole church; and with the Pope at their head, they gave forth their decrees as the infallible dictates of the Holy Ghost. Modern Papists do not deny the doctrine; nay, they publicly maintain what was solemnly decreed by the said councils, particularly that of Trent, that the indiscriminate reading of the word of God does more harm than good. Thus they prove themselves in opposition to the will of God, and to belong to that Antichrist who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

I engaged to prove the point from the writings of living Papists. Take, therefore, the following from the Orthodox Journal. “It must be acknowledged, Mr. Editor, that such a plan for propagating Christianity, (that is, by distributing the Bible) was totally unknown to past ages, and had escaped the notice of Him who was Wisdom itself, the co-eternal Son of God, the Author and Founder of Christianity. For, we no where find it recorded, that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind. He adopted the plain and simple method of verbal instruction; and, when about to leave this world, charged a chosen few, whom he had selected from his followers, to pursue the same plan, and preach, by word of mouth, the truths which they had received from him, no mention being made of distributing Bibles. Accordingly, we find the Apostles, in obedience to this divine commission, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion.

“ Such was the method by which the Christian religion was first established and propagated, at least if Scripture and church history speak the truth. Our Bible-men of the 19th century, may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the Apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass. It must be confessed, that the Bible-distributing scheme, *if it added to the burthens*, would have considerably lessened the labours of the Apostles, and would certainly have freed them from one care, that of providing themselves with successors, as in this scheme none were likely to be wanting. However, from the most authentic monuments, it is clear that no such plan for the propagation of Christianity was then adopted, but the plain simple method above mentioned, of appointing a set of men to deliver the truths of the Christian religion, by word of mouth, with an injunction upon the rest of mankind of hearing and receiving the truths thus delivered.

“ Indeed, Mr. Editor, our Bible-men ought to know that the books composing the New Testament, which is the part of Scripture which chiefly regards us Christians, were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. What then, (I put this question to the Bible-men) what was the guide to faith, or the rule of faith, during that period? Not the Old Testament, for this would have left Christians in the dark, as to the very first and most important articles of their belief. Not the New Testament, for this was not yet composed, nor consequently known, but in part, and that to a very small portion of believers. Most undoubtedly, Sir, the only rule of faith then known and universally received, was the preaching of the Apostles and their lawful successors. Every doctrine conformable to their preaching, was acknowledged to be of divine authority; while every doctrine, whether written or unwritten, contrary to their preaching, was rejected as spurious. When a dispute arose among the faithful, respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible or any other written authority referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the Apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem; and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were, by divine institution, the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, in every succeeding age, “the doctrines once delivered to the saints,” have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. This is the only rule of faith which the Scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience, under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience.

“ Reason itself, Mr. Editor, tells us, that the Scriptures, left to

private interpretation, cannot possibly form an unerring rule of faith and morals. To assert that the Almighty has left us his sacred word to be our sole guide in matters of religion, and, at the same time, giving authority to every individual to put upon this word whatever interpretation his private judgment, or want of judgment, suggests, is to convert the God of truth into a God of contradiction and falsehood, and to make the Deity responsible for all the errors, blasphemies, and absurdities of every heretic and fanatic, from the days of Ebion and Cerenthus, to Ann Lee, the shaker, and Johanna Southcott, the raving prophetess of the present day. What then is the conclusion to be drawn from the above observations? Clearly this, that the Bible-distributing scheme was not the method appointed by Christ for the propagation of Christianity, and, consequently, that the Bible Societies are preferring the folly of man before the wisdom of God." *O. J.* Vol. II. pp. 15—17.

Perhaps some apology is due to my readers for putting so much blasphemy and nonsense in my pages; but I did not know any other way by which I could so effectually expose the hatred with which modern Papists regard the Bible, and their opposition to the general circulation of the word of God. There is no occasion to go to the bulls of Popes and the canons of councils to prove that Papists are hostile to the free circulation of the Scriptures; their writings in the present day convict them. They do, therefore, prove themselves to be opposed to the authority of God, who has commanded his word to be made known to every creature.

If it shall be alleged, that the Editor of the *Orthodox Journal* is too contemptible to be cited as an authority in this, or any matter connected with religion; I answer, that this will readily be admitted by every Protestant who reads his writings: but he is by no means a contemptible person in the esteem of his own sect. He is praised in a high degree by most of his correspondents, who are unceasingly commending his excellent work. It will be recollected, that the very correspondent from whose letters I have quoted so largely in this Number, puffs him off as a man who understands the subject of religion, better than prophets and apostles did; and knows much better how to teach it; for which see the conclusion of my thirty-first Number. In fact, he is the champion, if not the oracle, of modern Papists, especially of those who resist the veto; and his writings are highly commended by the Bishop of Castabala, the Vicar Apostolic of the midland district.

Now, this said Editor and his correspondents, have set themselves down, to revile those who are labouring to give the poor the word of God; and they do not scruple to vilify the Bible itself. It is quite fair to consider them as expressing the sentiments of their brethren in general, unless some other writer of equal authority with bishop Milner, and Mr. Gandolphy, and the other cor-

respondents of the Orthodox Journal, shall come forward and publicly disavow such sentiments. Such disavowal has not been made by any Popish writer in England or Ireland, so far as I know ; and as they are well known to be in general hostile to the circulation of the Bible alone, they may be presumed to hold the same sentiments with the writer above quoted.

This writer asserts, that the Scriptures alone, that is, simply as they were given by the Almighty, *cannot possibly be an unerring rule of faith and morals* ; which is asserting plainly, that the word of God cannot accomplish the object intended by it, without human aid. Nay, from what follows, it is insinuated, that it will do incalculable mischief, if left to be privately interpreted ; and the writer has the presumption to say, that this mischief will be chargeable against God himself, if he shall permit his word to be generally read, and to be at the mercy of ignorant and perverse interpreters. No Protestant ever taught that the Almighty has given authority to every man, or to any man, to put upon his word whatever interpretation he pleases. He has given a revelation of his will sufficiently intelligible for the salvation of the guilty, and the instruction of the simple ; and persons to whom this revelation is made known by reading the Bible, are in no danger of misunderstanding it, if they really desire to understand it, and pray for divine instruction ; for God has promised his Spirit to guide into all truth. The words of God are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge. Such a knowledge of them as is connected with salvation, is the fruit of divine teaching. Under such teaching, the poor and illiterate, by means of the Bible, are made wise unto salvation. Without such teaching, the Holy Father of Rome, with all his army of cardinals, priests, and doctors, are no better than mere fools who hate knowledge. “ How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity ? and the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge ? Turn you at my reproof : Behold I will pour out my Spirit upon you ; I will make known my words unto you.” (Prov. i. 22, 23.) This is a public proclamation of the Author of the Bible. He requires it to be made known to all, without any consideration of the danger of misunderstanding it ; and he will secure against such danger by giving his Spirit, and making known his word, to all who apply their hearts to such knowledge.

I shall resume this subject in my next Number. In the meantime, I request my Popish readers to read the Bible. Let them see what it is which their priests are so anxious to conceal from them. If they find it unintelligible at first, let them read on, and they will find what is difficult or obscure in one passage made quite plain in another. The Bible contains the words of eternal life. Christ is in the Bible ; and he that finds him, finds life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXXV.

SATURDAY, MARCH 13th, 1819.

PAPISTS tell us that publishing and distributing the holy Scriptures is not the way which Christ appointed for the propagation of Christianity. They triumphantly maintain what nobody denies, that Christ commanded his apostles to teach all nations; that "accordingly we find the apostles, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, *by word of mouth*, the truths of religion." This, I say, is what no Protestant denies: but the Popish writer in the Orthodox Journal, on whose letter I am animadverting, adds some words which are not in the commission which Christ gave to the apostles; and of which the Apostles themselves were entirely ignorant. These words, and the doctrine founded upon them, are entirely of Popish origin. After the apostles, he slips in their *lawful successors*; and these, he says, are the pastors of the church in every succeeding age. He has not the hardihood to assert, though he evidently means it to be understood, that every priest or pastor of the church is a successor of the apostles; that he is equally commissioned by Christ to declare the "truths of religion by word of mouth;" and that he is equally infallible, or incapable of error in what he shall declare; at least, that this is the case when these pastors sit in council. If his words have not this meaning, I cannot see that they have any meaning at all. "When a dispute," says he, "arose among the faithful respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible, or any other written authority, referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem, and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were by divine institution the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, *in every succeeding age*, the doctrines once delivered to the saints have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. *This is the only rule of faith which the Scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience, under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience.*"

This, it will be allowed, is speaking plainly. Here the authority of the Bible is completely set aside; and, though it may seem a paradox, it is set aside by its own authority. "The Scriptures themselves hold out" no other rule of faith but the living voice of the pastors of the church! The bare word of a Romish priest, therefore, is the only rule of faith! Du Mans then said truly, in the Council of Trent, "the Bible is become useless!" The Bible, according to the *Orthodox Journal*, has denuded itself of all its authority in favour of the priests. With Protestants the mere statement of such absurdity and impiety is a sufficient refutation; and it would be utterly in vain to attempt to convince the writer by any scriptural argument, because, in his opinion the Bible has surrendered its authority to the pastors of the church; and because the Editor, whom he addresses, has written a much better book! Papists would act more like honest men, if they would openly avow themselves infidels, than by continuing to assume the name of Christians, while they vilify and reject the authority of the Christian revelation.

The writer, on whom I am animadverting, says, "we nowhere find it recorded that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind." From this we are left to infer that the writing of what Christ taught, was unauthorized by him; that the Apostles and Evangelists exceeded their commission when they wrote the New Testament; and then it follows, of course, that such writings have no authority when put in competition with the living voice of the pastors of the church, who are the successors of the apostles, who were not commanded by Christ to write his word, but to teach it by word of mouth. Thus Papists invest their pastors with supreme authority in religious matters, and ascribe no authority to the Bible, but such as the pastors choose to allow, and no meaning, but such as they choose to give it. Certainly the priests would have had much easier work to keep the people in ignorance, if the apostles had written nothing; it is evident that they owe them no good will for what they have done, and for the trouble which is daily given them by their writings.

Whether Christ commanded his word to be written or not, is of no consequence to us, seeing the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit did write it. Their writing of it was according to the will of Christ. He promised to send the Spirit to lead his apostles into all truth. Seeing, then, the Spirit led or directed the apostles to the measure of writing the New Testament, it follows that this was a part of the work which Christ appointed them to perform.

Besides, we find that Christ did command at least part of the New Testament to be written. "I was," says John, "in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as

of a trumpet, saying, What thou seest, *write in a book*, and send to the seven churches which are in Asia," &c. Again, "I am the first and the last; and am alive, and was dead; and behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the keys of death and hell. *Write therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter.*" Rev. i. 10, 11, 17—19. *Douay Version*. And we know that Christ did such honour to the written word of the Old Covenant, as to appeal to it as a witness for the truth of what he personally taught. Surely after the disciples believed that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God, especially after they were witnesses of his resurrection from the dead, they would consider his own simple testimony sufficient to confirm the truth of all that he said. Yet, in fact, he did not rest, nor call them to rest, upon his own simple testimony, though that was undoubtedly true; but he gave an example by which the apostles, and his followers, in all time coming, should try every doctrine by the *written word*. "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And he said unto them, Thus it is *written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day: and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv. 44—47. *Douay Version*. This, of itself, was enough to show the apostles, that their Lord and Master approved of the word written; and unless he had given them a special command not to write; they would consider themselves authorized to write down what they had seen, and heard, for the instruction of the church in all ages.

Further, it does not appear from the commission which Christ gave to his apostles, that their labours were to be confined to mere speaking "by word of mouth." Go, teach all nations;—Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, are the words of the commission; and the meaning of them evidently is, that the apostles were commanded to *make known* the gospel, —to *publish* it to every creature. They were not limited with regard to the means; but left at liberty to speak or write as they had opportunity.

My Popish Letter-writer depreciates the written word of the New Testament, and pleads on behalf of the pastors of the church, the lawful successors of the apostles, that we should rather hear them, because they are commissioned, in all succeeding ages, to teach mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion. This argument would have applied with much more force in our Saviour's time on earth, for there had been a regular succession of priesthood from the days of Moses; and there were many tradi-

tions taught by the scribes and doctors of the law, which had at least as good authority as any Popish tradition ; and yet we know that Christ spoke of such traditions, and such word-of-mouth teaching, only to condemn them, as making void the law, and seducing souls to their ruin.

I know that the preaching of the gospel—the declaration of divine truth by the living voice, is an ordinance of God, and an ordinance which he has been pleased to honour in a singular manner for the conversion of sinners ; but it is only when preachers publish the doctrine contained in the written word, that such a blessed effect follows. I might defy the world to produce a credible instance of conversion to God by any other sort of preaching than that of the truth contained in the Scripture.

Popish writers always proceed upon the presumption that their priests are successors of the apostles ; and that, of course, they have equal authority, individually or collectively, to decide on matters of faith. If they could prove this, the question would be at rest. If they could prove that they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, as the apostles were, in all that they preached and wrote, and when they assembled in council at Jerusalem to give forth their decree respecting the freedom of Gentile Christians from the obligation of the law of Moses ;—if, I say, they could prove themselves possessed of the same supernatural and miraculous endowments, we would regard them as successors of the apostles, and infallible teachers of Christianity : but, until they prove this by some sensible sign, we must be excused while we regard them as of no authority whatever in matters of religion ; nay, while we consider them as impostors and deceivers, who are employed as the agents of the prince of darkness, to accomplish the everlasting perdition of the souls of those who confide in them.

The truth is, the apostles never had any successors ; and if they had, we would never look for them among such characters as the Romish priests. Christ gave to his church apostles first ; that is, men divinely inspired for the extraordinary work to which they were called, as witnesses for Him, of what they had seen and heard : but, for the permanent edification of the church, and for preaching the gospel, in after ages, he gave pastors and teachers, men whose business it is not to publish any new doctrine, but merely to preach and make known what is already published in the Scriptures. I might illustrate this subject at great length ; but I believe it is sufficiently intelligible to my Protestant readers and as for my Popish readers, I know that all I might write upon it, would be no better than beating the air, for their minds are preoccupied by the idea that the Bible is not a rule of faith. any farther than it has the consent of their priests, who have set up their authority as equal to it, and above it.

If, however, I can show that modern as well as ancient Papists

are directly opposed to the word of God, and the free circulation of it, I shall have proved, to the satisfaction of every one who regards the Bible as of infallible authority, that Popery is Antichrist, and that it ought to be abhorred by every Christian.

In addition to the evidence already adduced, I shall now bring forward that of a dignitary and renowned champion of the Popish faith. This is no less a personage than Dr. Milner, Bishop of Castabala, and Vicar Apostolic of the midland district of England, of whom it is declared, by MR. ANDREWS, the Catholic Vindicator, that he is "the great and unanswerable living historical and theological disputant, Dr. Milner, than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed." (*C. V. No. X.*) This great, unanswerable, and incomparable divine writes as follows, in his pastoral charge to his clergy, dated 30th March, 1813:—

"Of late years, you know that numerous societies have been formed, and incredible sums of money raised, throughout the united kingdom, among Christians of other communions, for the purpose of distributing Bibles gratis, to all poor people who are willing to accept of them. In acting thus, they act conformably to the fundamental principles of *their* religion, which teach that the Bible contains all things necessary for salvation, and that it is easy to be understood by every person of common sense. But who could have imagined that Catholics, grounded upon quite opposite principles, should nevertheless show a disposition to follow the example of Protestants in this particular, by forming themselves also into *Bible Societies*, and contributing their money for putting the mysterious letter of God's word into the hand of the illiterate poor, instead of educating clergymen, even in the present distressing scarcity of clergy, to expound that word to them?" The Bishop then proceeds to make some observations upon what he calls "*the prevailing Biblio-mania*," (Bible madness) which, he says, he hopes his clergy "will not fail to impress upon the minds of their people."

The first remark is, that "when our Saviour Christ sent his apostles to convert the world, he did not say to them, Go and distribute volumes of the Scriptures among the nations of the world; but, Go into the whole world, and *preach* the gospel to every creature.

"2d. It is notorious that not one of the nations converted by the apostles or their successors, nor any part of a nation, was converted by reading the Scriptures. No: they were converted in the way appointed by Christ, that of preaching the gospel, as is seen in the Acts of the Apostles, Bede's History, &c.

"3d. *The promiscuous reading of the Bible is not calculated, nor intended, by God, as the means of conveying religious instruction to the bulk of mankind*: for the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters.

"In a word, it is evidently a much more rational plan to put the statutes at large into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, telling them to become their own lawyers, than it is to put the text itself of the mysterious Bible into their hands, for enabling them to hammer their religion and morality out of it.

"In conclusion, then," says the Bishop, "my dearly beloved brethren, I am confident you will not encourage or countenance the distribution of Bibles or Testaments, among the very illiterate persons of your respective congregations, as proper initiatory books of instruction for them."

The following are extracts of a letter from the same unanswerable and incomparable divine, than whom a more orthodox never breathed, to the Editor of the Orthodox Journal, and printed in that work for October, 1813. "I described a *Catholic Bible Society* as a novel and portentous institution; unknown to the Fathers and Doctors of past ages; at variance with the third rule concerning the use of holy Scripture, laid down by a committee of the Council of Trent; giving into the policy of Protestants, and of course injurious to the religion of Catholics, as also to the authority of their Pastors; it being the exclusive business of the latter to instruct all ranks of people, by expounding to them, *viva voce*, both Scripture and tradition."

Again, says this most orthodox divine, "The Tridentine Fathers make no distinction between Bibles, in the vulgar tongue, *with notes*, and those *without notes*; and it is evidently impossible to add any notes whatever to the sacred text, which will make it a safe and proper elementary book of instruction for the illiterate poor." That is, in plain English, the Bible is so thoroughly and incorrigibly a bad and a dangerous book, that all the safeguards which man can plant around it are insufficient to prevent it from doing mischief to those who shall read it, and form their own judgment of its contents!

"The Catholic Pastors," continues the Right Rev. Prelate, "can instruct, and do instruct their people, at the present day, in the manner they have instructed them in all days since those of Christ, much better than these Lay-Evangelists can teach them, with the help of Bibles, though they stereotyped all the linen in Ireland into Bibles; and the labouring poor in Ireland, *without a single Bible in a village*, know more of the revealed truths of the gospel, and can give a more rational, as well as more detailed account of them, than the same class of people can in this country, which the Bibliomaniacs boastingly call the *land of Bibles*. I am, &c. John Milner, D. D."

This is corroborated by the other writer in the Orthodox Journal, from whose letters I have made liberal extracts, and who puffs off the Editor's school book as so much better than the Bible; or, perhaps, the writer is the same, for the signature is M. and the style and sentiment very much resemble those of the

venerable Vicar Apostolic. This writer, be he who he may, writes as follows :—" We, *of the old school*, shall continue to think as the whole body of Christians thought for fifteen hundred years, and as nine out of ten of that body still think, that, as Christianity was first taught and established before that part of the Bible which contains the distinguishing doctrines of its Divine Founder was ever written, *so it might have been propagated and continued to the end of the world, had the Bible never made its appearance among Christians.* O. J. April, 1814, p. 140.

Most unhappily, however, for the church of Rome, the Bible has "made its appearance among Christians;" and it is more from the want of power than the want of will, that the priests do not conjure the *apparition* to the bottom of the Red Sea.

I find in the writings of modern Papists, in general, especially of those in the Orthodox Journal, a deep-rooted abhorrence of the Bible as a book of general instruction in matters of religion. There is indeed an affectation of respect for it, as it is locked up in the cloister, or to be found only in the hand of learned and discreet persons; but to put it into the hands of the common people, is considered as a step toward the subversion of all religion, and even of social order. It is with the Bible as with reason; people are not against it, unless it be against them. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved by the writings of living Papists, that they are against the Bible; that, of course, the Bible is against them; and, therefore, God, who is the Author of the Bible, is against them. Let them think how they will answer to Him for their contempt of his word and opposition to it.

The following decree of the Council of Trent, relating to the holy Scriptures, shall conclude the present Number. Some farther reflections on the subject may be expected in my next.

" Decree concerning the edition and use of the Sacred Books.

"Moreover, the same holy Synod considering that much benefit might accrue to the Church of God, if among all the Latin versions of the Sacred Books, that are in circulation, any one should be reckoned authentic: *Maketh* known, appoints, and declares, that the old and common edition which has been approved for so many centuries in the Church, and in public readings, disputations, preachings, and expositions, be reckoned authentic: and that no man dare or presume to reject it, on any pretence whatever.

"Besides, for restraining petulant wits, it decrees, that no man, leaning to his own understanding, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—twisting the holy Scripture to their own sense; dare to interpret the holy Scriptures contrary to the sense that the holy mother Church (to

whom it belongs to judge of the *true* sense of the holy Scriptures) hath holden and does hold ; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers ; though these interpretations be never intended to be published. Those who contravene this statute shall be reported by the Ordinary, and punished by the pains ordained by law.

“ But, being also willing to place a limit to printers, in this matter, as is right, who now, without any rule, thinking it right for them to do what they please, without license of their Ecclesiastical Superiors, print these books of holy Scripture, along with annotations and expositions of any sort indifferently, often without the printer’s name, and often even under a fictitious name, and, which is worse, without the name of the author, and have such printed books sold elsewhere : it *decrees* and ordains, that henceforth the holy Scriptures, even this ancient and Vulgate edition, shall be printed in the most correct manner, and that it shall be lawful to none to print, or cause print, any book on sacred subjects, without the name of the author, nor in future to sell, or even to keep by them, unless first examined and approved by the Ordinary, under pain of excommunication, and the fine set on this offence by the last Council of Lateran. And if they are regulars, besides examination and probation of this sort, they are also bound to obtain a license from their superiors, the books being acknowledged by them according to the form of their ordination.

“ They also who communicate to others, or publish by writing, unless it be first examined and proved, shall be liable to the same punishment as printers. And those who have them in their possession, or read them, shall be held as the authors, unless they give up the real authors.

“ And the approbation of books of this sort is to be given in writing, so that it may appear in front of the written or printed book. And the whole of this examination and approbation is to be done gratis, that what is good may be approved, and what is bad rejected.”

Here the arrogance and intolerance of the church of Rome appear, in binding all men down to one translation of the Bible. Even their own translations into modern languages, by the index of Pius IV. are forbidden books ; and it is an unpardonable sin to read them without license from a Bishop or Inquisitor. And, as if this were too great a privilege, in the after edition of Clement IV. it is declared “ that all power of granting such license is taken away.” But the chief thing to be observed in the above decree, is an absolute prohibition of the exercise of private judgment in reading the Scriptures ; which is as bad as a prohibition of reading them. It is made a very dangerous thing to read the Bible ; for if one should find a meaning in a passage different from what the church gives it, he is to be punished by the pains ordained by her, and in point of fact many have suffered death for no greater crime.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXXVI.

SATURDAY, MARCH 20th, 1819.

IN my two last Numbers, I endeavoured to establish the fact, that living popish writers are hostile to the general distribution of the Bible; and that they consider it as not intended by God as the means of conveying religious instruction to mankind. This is the avowed opinion of that most "unanswerable" and "orthodox" divine, Bishop Milner, whose words are quoted in my last Number, and who gives this as a reason for withholding the sacred word from the bulk of mankind, that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters."

Here is a wonderful exhibition of love and respect for the Holy Scriptures. Here is such tenderness of conscience, in a Right Reverend Prelate, that he will consider nothing lawful or expedient, but what is commanded, in so many words, in the Bible; and as he does not find it commanded that all mankind should learn to read, he will have no hand in furnishing them with Bibles, or in enabling them to peruse them.

It is undoubtedly true, there is not in the Bible, so far as I recollect, a direct commandment, requiring all men to go to school and learn the letters: and a Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic, that is, one who stands in the place of an apostle, and has all the authority of an apostle over English Papists, pleads the want of such a command, as an argument that the word of God was not intended by its Author for general circulation.

Had such an argument been advanced by some poor layman, it would, perhaps, have called forth no answer but a smile of pity. But it is brought forward by the highest popish authority in the kingdom;—by a man, who, to his official weight as a Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic, adds that of wonderful personal endowments, being unanswerable, both as a historian and a theologian, and as orthodox a divine as ever breathed. I must be excused if I feel a little elated, when I enter the lists with such a man; and the reader must have patience with me, while I attempt to answer the argument, not so much for its own sake, as for the sake of its dignified author.

I reply, then, that the Bible was not given for the purpose of instructing us in those things of a secular nature which are with-

in the reach of our own natural understanding. The word of God is conversant about things spiritual and eternal. It makes known what we could never have discovered by our own efforts. It declares the eternal love of God, the Father, to our ruined world, so that he sent his Son, Jesus Christ, into the world, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. He gave commandment that this truth should be published to all the world, that sinners, coming to the knowledge of it, and believing it, might be saved. But he did not think it necessary to prescribe the precise mode of its publication in every instance. He did, indeed, command it to be preached; this implied a command to the people to hear it. He commanded John to write to the seven churches in Asia; this implied a command to the churches to read what was written to them. Speaking of the spreading of the gospel throughout the world, and the calamities that should come upon the Jewish people, Christ says, Mat. xxiv. 15. "Whoso *readeth* let him understand." This implies that the persons addressed should be able to read; and there was no occasion for a specific command that they should go to school, or have a tutor at home, or learn from their parents. This was a matter belonging to the common-sense business of every family, and for which no divine revelation was necessary.

When Jesus Christ spoke to the apostle John from heaven, and said "what thou seest write in a book," he did not instruct the apostle to provide himself with pen, ink, and parchment. This was a matter that would occur to himself, without a divine revelation, as absolutely necessary to his obeying the divine command. In all such matters, if I may use the expression, Christ trusts to the discretion and common sense of his people. When he gives a commandment, and the means of obeying are such as will occur to an enlightened understanding, he does not make such means the subject of a special revelation; yet, if necessary to the end, they are as really commanded as the end itself.

We are commanded to "search the Scriptures." Every one who hears such a command, must see that it requires, on the part of the hearer, ability to read, unless there be some natural impediment, such as the want of sight. Christ commanded the apostles to teach all nations what they had seen and learned of him. This they did by word of mouth, as far as they were able; but, as their living voice could not reach the millions of men scattered over the face of the whole earth, they committed the word to writing, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who guided their pens, as he did their tongues, to declare the whole truth of God for the salvation of sinners, and the edification of those who, by means of it, should be saved from their sins.

The word of God, thus written, they threw upon the world, and the providence of Him who gave it, to supply the place of

their voice, after they should be dead. The apostle Peter plainly declares this to be the design of his writing. "Moreover," says he, "I will endeavour, that you may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." 2 Epist. i. 15. This he did, not by the appointment of a successor, to repeat them by word of mouth, but by writing one epistle and then another, and by commending the writings of his beloved brother, Paul, in which, though he says there are *some* things hard to be understood,* yet the simple fact of his recommending them to Christians in general, shews that, in his

* "And account that the long-suffering of our God is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of those things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. This passage is often referred to by Papists, to confirm their doctrine, that the Bible is not intended for general reading, and that the unlearned are in danger of being injured by it. But Paul himself, writing to the same people, to wit, Christians who were Jews by birth, lets us know the reason why some things which he taught were hard to be understood. It was not because the things themselves were unintelligible; but because the people were dull of apprehension. (See Heb. v. 11.) They had been so long accustomed to look upon the shadows of the Mosaic law as of perpetual duration, that they could not clearly see the substance when it had come, and when the shadows were superseded by it. To minds thus preoccupied, very plain things appeared very mysterious. It is so with persons of the Romish communion at this day. The most liberal and intelligent among them, have their minds so prepossessed and bewildered with the ideas of a visible, universal, infallible church; with a visible head and apostolic succession; with the merit of good works, penances, pilgrimages, purgatory, &c. that the plainest passages in the word of God appear to them quite unintelligible. Most of the errors taught by their church they look upon as infallible truths, and first principles, which must not be called in question. Coming to the Bible with minds thus preoccupied, they must find many things mysterious and inexplicable, because it is impossible to make them bend to what they have already fixed in their minds as the truth. In this unhappy condition, they generally find it most comfortable to let the Bible alone, and acquiesce in the infallible teaching of the church.

Arguing from the passage in 2 Pet. above quoted, Papists always proceed upon the principle that the bulk of Christians must be unlearned; and it will be allowed that the Church of Rome has always been successful in keeping the bulk of its members in that condition. But this is not a Christian state of things. Peter speaks of being unlearned as a sinful state, the same as being unstable. Every Christian, therefore, is required to be *learned* in the things which relate to the salvation of his soul, that is, to be learned in the Scriptures. Paul exhorts the Ephesian Christians to "be not unwise, but *understanding* what the will of the Lord is." (Epist. v. 17.) And he speaks of Christians in a prosperous state of mind, as being "filled with the knowledge of his will." Every evangelical Protestant pastor labours and prays that this may be the condition of his people. But the nature and effect of popish teaching appear by the following answer, which a poor Papist gave lately to some questions of a religious nature. "Please your Honour, we leave all these things to God and the priest."

esteem, or rather of the Holy Ghost who inspired him, they were fit for general reading, and able to teach all mankind the way of salvation, through the long—suffering and tender mercy of God. Both these apostles, and all the others whose writings were given to the world, testify the good news of the glory of Christ. They declare that the same Jesus who was crucified, is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the forgiveness of sins. By their writings, the Apostles are still speaking to the world; and by writing, as well as by word of mouth they obeyed the command of their master,—teach, preach, publish, make known the good news to every creature.

The New Testament, thus thrown upon the world, fell, in the first instance, into the hands of Christians, who knew its value; and it became their duty to publish and make known its contents to all around them. There was no occasion for a divine command to learn to read, or to teach all men to read; for the command to search the Scriptures necessarily implied this, as much as the command to the apostle John to write, implied that he should be furnished with the necessary materials. Follow out this principle, and it will be found to afford a sufficient warrant for printing and circulating the Bible; for establishing schools to teach the art of reading; and every other means which Christian prudence and benevolence may devise, for communicating to the world the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

The whole world might have been enlightened by the knowledge of this truth many centuries ago, had Christians of the second and following ages possessed the spirit of Christians of the first age. Had the impulse which was given by the preaching and writing of apostles and evangelists continued through subsequent ages, every Christian church would have had a company of zealous and faithful missionaries employed in distributing the word of God, and declaring its contents, to the heathen all around them. Daily inroads would thus have been made upon the kingdom of Satan. The reign of idolatry and superstition would have given place to the reign of righteousness and peace. The earth would have been filled with a holy seed, and heaven with an innumerable company, out of all kindreds, and tongues and people, and nations.

The time is approaching when this shall be realized, as we are assured by Old and New Testament prophecy; and it will be so, when Christians and Christian Churches shall have returned to the principles which were abandoned at so early a period; and shall be animated by the same spirit of love and zeal which marked the character and the conduct of those of the first age. Nothing remains to be done, but what ought to have been done seventeen hundred years ago; and which was prevented only by the false principles and corrupt practices which began to prevail even before the close of the first century. All the churches, without excep-

tion, and the Church of Rome, in particular, neglected the important duty of giving the word of God, and publishing the gospel to the whole world. Nay, the Church of Rome having gotten possession of it, locked it up from the sight of all but a chosen few. She, therefore, is justly chargeable with the guilt of slaying the many millions who have perished for lack of knowledge. Other churches cannot plead innocent, considering how little they have actually done for promoting Christianity; but the Church of Rome herself must sustain the greatly aggravated guilt of positively withholding the means of promoting it, by prohibiting the translation and distribution of the Holy Scriptures.

Bishop Milner tells us that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters." This shows us the low esteem in which the common people are held by priests of the Romish communion. It is not considered a duty to promote their mental improvement, because there is no divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters. Christianity teaches us to promote, in every possible way, the mental improvement as well as the eternal salvation of our fellow creatures. This is implied in the comprehensive commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This, however, has no place in the popish system. If the priests find the people ignorant, they will keep them so. They will instruct them only in such things as will give them an awful and distant respect for their ghostly authority: but they will take care to prevent, as far as they are able, the people from having access to the source of knowledge, lest they should think and judge for themselves. Though there were nothing else objectionable in the popish system, this alone would mark it out as not of divine origin, because it is hostile to the improvement and civilization of the human race.

Having thus paid my respects to the avowed writings of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Castabala, I return to the Correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, who subscribes himself M. who, if not Dr. Milner himself, expresses the same sentiments, as the reader will see by turning to my thirty-fourth Number, in which I gave large extracts from his letters. In page 270, I quoted his words, which are as follows:—"Our Bible-men of the 19th century may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the Apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass."

I have the charity to think that the writer considered himself as addressing only persons of his own communion,—persons who were studiously kept in ignorance, and who were left to suppose that matters, in our Saviour's time on earth, with regard to the publication of books, were precisely the same as they are now. Papists in our day, even though they cannot read, see that what is

called the Bible is comprised in a small volume that any man may carry in his pocket, and of which one might carry twenty in a knapsack. The writer takes for granted that it was the same at the time when the Apostles received their commission; and, by this assumption, he attempts to delude his readers into the idea that the distribution of Bibles is not approved by Christ. If the writer did not know the real state of matters, in this respect, he was guilty of great presumption in attempting to write upon it; if he did know it, then he is guilty of wilfully misleading and deceiving those who confide in him.

My Protestant readers must bear with me while I state a fact, of which they do not need to be informed; but which I take to be necessary for the information of my readers of the Romish communion,—that, in the time of the apostles, a single copy of the Old Testament, written upon skins, was as much as a man could carry; that those who could write copies of it correctly were comparatively few; and that, had the Apostles been set to the work of writing them with their own hands, it was not possible that they could attend to the work of preaching. It does not appear that the apostles carried Bibles about with them. Their minds were familiar with the contents of the Old Testament, on which they were enabled, by the Holy Spirit, to draw at all times. Whenever they came to a synagogue of Jews, or a church of Christians, they would find a copy to which they could refer; and when they addressed either Jews or Gentiles, there was a power in their preaching, accompanied by the miracles which they wrought, that made it manifest that God was with them.

The gift of miracles accompanied that of inspired preaching. Those who possess not the former, can lay no just claim to the latter; and, therefore, no man has a right to demand, for his word-of-mouth teaching, the respect and obedience which were yielded to apostles, unless he can show himself possessed of the same miraculous endowments.

The mode of teaching which the apostles adopted, in the first instance, was that of declaring the divine message by word of mouth. Afterwards they committed it to writing; their writings completed the revelation of God to men; and, together with those of the Old Testament, they form a divine and infallible standard of faith and practice. Notwithstanding the labour and expense of multiplying copies before the invention of printing, copies were multiplied, and translated into various languages at a very early period. It was the duty of Christians to multiply them; and had they continued to do so, and had they given attention to their contents, they might have been preserved from the flood of error and superstition, which so soon overwhelmed them.

Should any of my popish adversaries reply, that had it been the will of Christ to propagate Christianity by the distribution of Bibles, he would have enabled mankind to invent the art of printing in the apostolic age. I have only to answer, that it does

not appear to have been a part of his plan, as a teacher come from God, to instruct men in any thing which they were capable of learning or discovering by their own ingenuity; and that the art of writing, tedious as it is in comparison of printing, was sufficient to multiply copies of the Scriptures for all needful purposes, had men but devoted themselves to the work with a diligence in any degree proportioned to its magnitude and importance.

Our Orthodox Letter-writer informs us, that the books of the New Testament were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. If by this he means the period when the Apostles received their commission, or when the Holy Ghost came upon them, on the day of Pentecost, he states what is not the fact; for the greater part of the New Testament was written within half a century of that period, and during the life of those who were witnesses of the events recorded in it. I have before me an interesting work of *Père Lamy*, a divine of the Romish Church, and one who pays a thousand times more respect to the Bible than our modern Papists do. The work is entitled, "An Introduction to the Holy Scriptures." Speaking of the period in which the books of the New Testament were written, he says, Matthew wrote his gospel only six years after the crucifixion: Mark wrote his ten years, and Luke his twenty-three years thereafter; and that the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles of Paul, together with those of Peter, were written within thirty-three years of the same period. He does not pretend to fix the dates of the Epistles of James and Jude; but he brings the latest writings of John within sixty-five years of Christ's death; and there is no part of the inspired writings even pretended to be of later date than those of John. Lamy states these facts on evidence that satisfied him, though absolute certainty is, perhaps, not to be obtained in a matter of this kind. Then it is not true that a century elapsed after Christianity was announced to the world, before the greater part of the New Testament was written. The binding obligation of the law of Moses remained in every respect until Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished." It was but a few years after that period, when the Scriptures of the New Testament were written; and, in the interval, the church was favoured with the personal presence of the apostles, whose living voice supplied a rule of faith of equal authority with that of Christ; for, according to his own declaration, they that heard them heard him.

These things may appear at first view of small importance, but they are really of great importance in the popish question. It is with the Church of Rome a fundamental point to get her clergy acknowledged as successors of the apostles; and to have the same authority and power with which Christ endowed these his extraordinary ambassadors. It would help very much to the attainment of this end, if it were allowed that a hundred years elapsed between the expiring of the old dispensation and the

writing of the New Testament; because it is well known that the Apostles did not live so long; and the Church of Rome would shove in, behind them, their lawful successors, whose living voice was to be the only rule of faith, as that of the apostles had been. But the fact of the matter, plainly stated, overthrows the whole system. The apostles left their writings, which were divinely inspired, as their only successors; and, until these writings were completed, some of them remained alive to give instruction, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with regard to every doctrine and practice, respecting which a question might be agitated in any of the churches. When they had not personal access to any of the apostles, they consulted them by writing to them, and received an answer in writing. The seventh chapter of first Corinthians is evidently an answer to a letter which Paul had received from the church in Corinth.— Since the death of the apostles, the Scriptures have been the church's only guide. They will be so till the end of the world; and there is no need of any other, for they are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

My opponents complain that I take my representations of Popery from the writing of enemies, and not from their own approved authors. The complaint, however, is unfounded, as the reader will see by this and some of my preceding Numbers: for, independently of the Council of Trent, whose authority is supreme in the Church of Rome, I have quoted largely from the very works of my opponents themselves, which I hope they will admit to be approved writings. Besides quoting and replying to the *Orthodox Journal*, I have presumed to attempt an answer to the most "unanswerable" and most "orthodox" Dr. Milner. Both he and Mr. Andrews, indeed, are unanswerable on some points; not from the truth and accuracy, but from the extreme absurdity, of their statements.

If a man should come boldly forward, and deny that two and three make five, I presume most persons would think him unanswerable, at least unworthy of a serious answer. Yet the proposition that two and three make five, is not more evident to those who understand the terms, than the proposition, that, if the Bible be the word of God, it will do good, and not evil; and that all ought to read it, is evident to every mind under the influence of Christianity. Yet this proposition is solemnly denied by the Council of Trent, and by all the Popish authorities of the present day. There is really, therefore, no arguing with Papists upon the principles either of Christianity or common sense. There is no common ground on which we can meet them. Through the influence of a dark and cruel superstition, their minds are unsusceptible of impressions from moral evidence; and this is not surprising, seeing they actually refuse the evidence of their own senses.

Mr. Andrews is much offended with Luther for comparing the Papists of his day to asses. I am aware that my Paper will not rise in dignity by descending to use the language of the Reformer in this instance; but really I cannot help thinking the asses are dishonoured by the comparison; for I defy the Church of Rome to produce an ass that will refuse the evidence of his own senses—that will be so stupid as to mistake a bundle of hay for a human body; yet such stupidity is exemplified by Papists every day, in their sacrifice of the mass, and their doctrine of transubstantiation.

THE
Protestant,

No. XXXVII.

SATURDAY, MARCH 27th, 1819.

I DARE say I have written more than enough to convince every reader, that the Church of Rome is hostile to the circulation and the reading of the Holy Scriptures. The avowed doctrine of that Church, as laid down by the last of her general councils, a late Bull of the Pope, and the writings of modern Papists, as quoted in my late Numbers, all go to establish the fact, that the Church of Rome is against the word of God. It follows, as a thing of course, that the word of God, and God himself, is against the Church of Rome; and that, though she may maintain her ground for a while, like the heathen parts of the kingdom of Satan, she must ultimately be consumed by the Spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

The subject of withholding the word of God, has occupied seven Numbers of my work. I hope my Protestant readers will not think I have given it more space than the importance of the subject required, for it is really a fundamental point; and having convicted the Church of Rome of direct hostility against the divine testimony, I hope it will be allowed that I have succeeded in proving her to be the Antichrist that was spoken of by the Apostles of Christ, as to arise in the latter days; and if there be any persons at present within the pale of that church, who regard the salvation of their souls, the command of God to such is, to come out of her, that they be not partakers of her sins, and that they receive not of her plagues.

I have not the vanity to think, that what I have written will make much impression on the minds of such persons as Dr. Milner, and Mr. Andrews, and the other writers of the present day, who oppose the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. My labour, however, will not have been in vain, if I have put the public in general upon their guard against the pretensions of those men, who advocate the cause of the Church of Rome, and who endeavour to soften down all the monstrosities of the system; but who, while they oppose the circulation and the reading of the Bible, show enough of the cloven foot to make it manifest that the authority under which they act, is that of the prince of darkness. I hope I have shown also what we may expect whenever Papists shall acquire power and authority among us: the Bible will be prohibited; and those who presume to read it, will be punished according to the decree of the holy Council of Trent.

I believe it is usual, in writing upon religious subjects, as well

as in preaching, to connect doctrine with practice: following what I take to be a very good rule, I shall now proceed to the practical improvement of my subject, that is, to adduce certain instances of the actual practice of Papists, even in the present day, of withholding the word of God from the people in general, and making it a crime to have it in possession, or to read it, or even to acquire the art of reading, so as to have access to it.

In the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, is a Spanish New Testament, printed at Venice, in 1556. It had no doubt been printed without the knowledge of the church, or holy Inquisition; as there is no record of their having granted permission for such an undertaking. On the title page is written "Granville Sharp," and a remarkable memorandum is prefixed with his own hand, as follows:—"Mem. Several years ago, I presented this Castilian Testament to an eminent Spaniard, a merchant of Bilboa, who was delighted with it during his temporary abode in London; but, just before his departure for Spain, he returned the book, being afraid to carry it with him, lest it should be discovered by the searchers of his baggage, and occasion the forfeiture of all his goods, G. S." *Correspondence, &c. between Messrs. Gandolphy, Blair, &c. p. 87.* Such was the hostility known to exist by this Spaniard among his countrymen, against the word of God, that he durst not carry home a copy in his own language. What must be the state of things in Spain, with regard to religion, when a respectable individual of that country is led to make such a humiliating declaration? In Spain Popery is to be seen in its true character. There it has received no softening from Protestant influence, and it is as it appears there that we ought to judge of it; for the apparent amelioration of the system in this country, is merely accidental; and if the causes which have produced such amelioration were removed, it would appear in Britain as bad as it is in Spain. From the open declarations of Bishop Milner, and the Orthodox Journalist, against the Bible, and their incessant outcry about the danger of reading it, there cannot be a doubt that they would, if they were able, prohibit the book and the reading of it, under a penalty, perhaps heavier than the confiscation of goods.

The following extract of a letter from Paris, of date the 25th ultimo, which appeared in the London Star of the 1st of the present month, will show the hostility which exists among certain clergy of that country against education and reading the Bible:—"We have, with some difficulty, procured M. Durand's Lent Mandement or Homily: he is the capitulary Vicar General of Besancon. M. Durand warns every one to avoid penetrating into the mysteries of the gospel; and he triumphantly asks, who would believe in God if it were necessary to comprehend him? In his holy zeal the vicar general declares the Lancasterian schools an invention of the devil; and cautions all his flock to beware of sending their children to them. If they do, they will incur excommunication here, and damnation hereafter. He invites, with Moloch ferocity, his diocese to exterminate the heretics, (that

is the Protestants.) It is, he says, a mark of grace; its omission is a mortal sin."

There are many thousands of Papists, chiefly Irish, who reside in St. Giles', and the neighbouring parishes in London, whose children are suffered to grow up in the grossest ignorance and vice. A few years ago, some benevolent individuals established schools for the gratuitous education of such children, in the arts of reading, writing, &c.: that no alarm might be excited in the minds of the parents, or their priests, it was expressly stipulated, that no catechism should be used in the schools, and no means used to make the children Protestants; that, in short, nothing should be admitted on the subject of religion, but the plain simple letter of the English Bible. But this benevolent plan met with the most determined opposition from the priests, some of whom plainly declared before the Committee of the House of Commons, that it was much better for the children not to be able to read, than to learn this art, without learning, at the same time, their Popish catechism. See proof of this, at great length, in the Report of the Committee, printed in 1816.

The last Report of the Hibernian Society furnishes numerous instances of the opposition of the priests in Ireland to the reading of the Scriptures, and even the instruction of the children in the art of reading, when it is understood that the Bible is used in the schools. One of the teachers writes as follows:—"January 10th, 1818. I herewith send you the protest of two priests against the use of the Scriptures in the schools. It is taken *verbatim* from the book, which lies on the table for the remarks of the visiting committee. The priests continue exceedingly angry with the parents who persist, at least many of them, to send their children to the schools, notwithstanding all that they have said and threatened." The following is the protest of the said priests:—"Having observed that the children of our communion are obliged to read the Protestant version of the New Testament, we protest against the introduction of *any version*; and we are determined to withdraw the children from the school, by every means in our power, unless the rule which prescribes a portion of the Holy Scriptures to be daily read be annulled. Signed, J. P. J. R. A true copy, T. G." *Report for 1818, page 40.*

Another teacher writes as follows:—"June 23d, 1817. Some time ago, I apprehended much injury would be done to the Society's schools under my care, in consequence of the Catholic priest opening a free school in his chapel, and charging his flock to send their children to it, or else they would be finally ruined. He publicly lectured on this subject for three successive sabbaths; notwithstanding which, only one of my pupils left me. This child had been very sick for some time, and its parents were made to believe, that it was a judgment sent on the child, for being at the Society's school. Since then, as a child at the priest's free school was reading in a Testament which he took with him to the school, the master struck the child a violent blow, took the Testament from him, cursed the child, and asked if he

was going to turn a heretic. The child told this to his parents; upon which they withdrew him and his sister from the priest's school, and put them both to mine; at which they would learn to read the word of God." *page 72.* This is the way in which the people ought to treat their priests, and every body else who would hinder them or their children from reading the Bible. It is gratifying to see the manifestation of such a spirit; there are not a few instances of it now in Ireland; and if it shall become general, as I hope it will by and by, Ireland will be prepared for a much more important emancipation, than that which Papists are thinking of, and demanding with so much clamour;—she will be emancipated from the slavery of superstition and error, raised to the enjoyment of rational liberty; and every hamlet and cabin will be accessible to the word of God, and the salvation which it reveals.

In these reflections, I am happy to have the concurrence of some of the Irish of the Romish communion. One of the Society's inspectors of schools writes as follows:—"May 25th, 1817. The few days I have been in this neighbourhood, I have had frequent conversations with many of the Catholics, who exclaim greatly against their clergy, for prohibiting the reading of the Scriptures. One man, in particular, said that, if all mankind were of his opinion, superstition, idolatry, and the fear of man, would soon cease, and Scripture knowledge would prevail and flourish gloriously in the world." The same inspector gives the following account of one of the schools, and of its teacher:—"Visited F—'s school at R.— He had 88 pupils assembled; 16 of whom read the 2d of Ephesians, and gave pertinent answers to questions from it. I am glad to say, that both masters and pupils, in this country, are progressively advancing in the knowledge of the Scriptures: and I perceive that when the pupils are enlightened with this knowledge, the masters of such are much affected with the necessity and importance of it. I greatly rejoiced to hear Mr. F— (whom I knew to have been brought up in the Church of Rome,) explain, from the Scriptures, the gospel very clearly. He said, I bless the day that Mr. B— gave me a Bible, and advice how to read it. He added, I brought it home, but did not dare to read it, except in private, lest my friends or the parish-priest should hear of it: but, in the course of some time, I lost the fear of man; and now I can say, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. I acknowledge to all around me, that the Scriptures are the true word of God. This declaration made me many enemies in the country; and even my nearest friends and acquaintance were against me; but especially the priest of the parish, who used every exertion to prevent and stop me." *pp. 47, 48.*

The Report before me contains many such instances of priestly opposition to the Bible, and of the determination of the people not to submit to the controul of their ghostly guides. One priest, besides a heavy penance, laid a poor woman "under an obliga-

tion, on pain of inevitable destruction, never to open a Bible, or converse with a Protestant on the subject of religion. All this, however, did not do; for though, while terrified and intimidated by the threats and injunctions of her confessor, she had unwillingly promised obedience, she relapsed in a few days, and returned to her Bible." *p.* 22. I do not expect that my work will speedily reach the remote parts of Ireland, which are held in bondage by these priests of the god of darkness, else I would entreat the people who have access to schools and to the Bible, diligently to improve the opportunity of acquiring the knowledge of that blessed book, which they may rest assured will do them no hurt, and which may be the instrument of conveying to them the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, which is eternal life.

Though I have not access to the benighted parts of Ireland, I am happy that many Irishmen and other Romanists in this country read my Papers. Let me entreat such to read the Bible. I propose to myself no higher aim than this. I will be glad if my work is laid aside, and never thought of again, if it shall only be the means of exciting my readers to read and study the word of God. Let me entreat, also, that those who can read, will advise those of their acquaintance who cannot, to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded for acquiring that most necessary art. There are many schools now established in Glasgow, for educating the old as well as the young; and both old and young are made welcome to receive, without money and without price, the benefits of education, as well as the blessings of religion.

I believe an idea prevails very generally among Protestants, that the reading of the Scriptures is not so much calculated to convert sinners, as the preaching of the gospel; and I doubt not the experience of past ages will be found to confirm the doctrine of the Westminster Divines, that "the Spirit of God maketh the reading, but *especially the preaching*, of the word, an effectual means of convincing and converting sinners." But I stay not at present to inquire, whether this arises from something in the nature of preaching more than in that of reading? whether there be any scriptural ground to expect more from the one than from the other? or whether it be not enough to account for the fact, that the experiment, with regard to giving the Scriptures and reading them, has never yet been so extensively made as that of preaching has been? It is enough to know that conversion is the work of God; and that, in ordinary cases, he effects it by means of his word, revealed to the heart and understanding, through the medium of hearing or reading. Of the blessed effects of the latter we have many recent instances, of which the following is a specimen:—"Dr. Carey, in one of his letters, speaking of 19 natives who had come to him to request Christian baptism, mentions, that 18 of them had become converts to Christianity, by reading of the Bible alone, having never heard the missionaries preach: their acquaintance with Christian truth and doctrine was derived entirely from the solitary and

unaided perusal of the Scriptures." See *Third Report of the Calton and Bridgeton Association for Religious Purposes*, p. 71.

I recommend to my readers of the Romish communion the perusal of the Bible, with the more confidence of being attended to, seeing I have the concurrence of some of the greatest of their own saints and fathers. The Council of Trent, the present Pope, and all the modern authorities, down to Dr. Milner, have actually departed from the ancient doctrine of their own church. This I will prove by reference to St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and others, who spake of the Bible as if they had been English Protestants.

I translate the words of these saints from the preface to a translation of the New Testament into French, by the Faculty of Theology of Louvain, printed at Mons, in 1667. The translators themselves seem to have been of a different spirit from Papists of the present day, as they not only gave their countrymen a version of the New Testament in their own language, but strongly recommended it to the perusal of all classes of the people.* The following are the words of the translators rendered into English, and those of the fathers will appear as quoted by them :—

“ Now if God heretofore commanded his people to read unceasingly in the law, and has given it for their meditation day and night ; and if the orders of religious believe themselves bound to read every day the *Rule* which they have received from their founder, how can we neglect to read the law of Jesus Christ, whose words are spirit and life ; and being entered, by baptism, into the Catholic and Universal Religion, of which Jesus Christ is the founder, we ought to look on the gospel as our *Rule*, which makes known to us his will, confirms his promises, which is our light in this world, and which will one day be our judge in that which is to come. The word that I speak unto you shall judge you at the last day. This is that which made St. Cesaire, Bishop of Arles, say, that those who cannot read are not excusable, on that account, to be ignorant of what may be learned by the reading of the gospel ; for, if the plainest and most homely persons, not only in the cities, but also in the villages, find means (saith this Saint) to read and learn profane and worldly songs, how can they, after this, excuse themselves for their ignorance, in having learned nothing of the gospel ? You have

* It is a fact, that more liberty of reading the Scriptures has been allowed to all classes of the people in France, for a hundred years past, than is allowed by the Popish priests in England and Ireland to their people, at the present day. Charles Butler, Esq. who is said to be one of the most liberal and enlightened of the Romish communion in Britain, declares as follows, in his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, June 13th, 1816 :—“ In point of fact,” says he, “ there has not, for the last century, been in France, (as I have informed myself from good authority) any objection to reading the Old or New Testament in the French tongue, or without notes, by any age, or any description of people.”

plenty of invention, adds he, to learn to read what the devil teaches you for your destruction, but not enough to learn what you are taught from the mouth of Jesus Christ,—the truth which should save you."

The translators proceed:—"It would be an endless task to relate all that the holy fathers have said of the excellence of the gospel. All their works are full of the marks of respect which they have, not only for the sacred history of the life of Jesus Christ, but also for the other books which compose the New Testament."—Again, "Not to say that it is not a very useful labour to gather from the writings of the fathers, who are the true interpreters of this holy book, explanations and notes which will aid us very much in the understanding its divine truths and holy instructions: but we conceive this a work altogether different, and of another kind from that, and though useful in itself, does not prevent a simple translation, like the present, from being useful to believers: for we hope, that not only the more enlightened minds, but the more simple, may find that which is necessary for their instruction, whilst they read, in an entire simplicity of heart, approaching humbly to the Son of God, and saying, with St. Peter, Lord to whom shall we go, &c.; and it is thou alone who can teach us. We must come to him like those of whom it is said in the gospel, that they come to hear him and be healed of their diseases: for "curiosity," according to St. Augustine, "is one of the diseases of the soul, insomuch the more dangerous that it is the more hid; and if we think of nothing but to satisfy it, in reading the word of the Lord, this would be to nourish our disorders by the very remedy which ought to cure them. He who seeks nothing in the Scriptures but his own salvation, will find it there, and that knowledge which he did not seek."

"Holy Scripture," says St. Gregory, "is like a great flood which has run, and will always run, to the end of the world. The great and the little, the strong and the weak, find there that living water which springs up to heaven; it offers itself to all, it proportions itself to all; it has a simplicity which stoops even to the souls of the most simple, and a height which gives exercise and elevation to those who are highest. All may draw indifferently, and so far from being able to empty it, in filling ourselves, we will always leave depths of knowledge and wisdom, where we may adore without being able to comprehend."

"But what ought to comfort us, under this obscurity, is that," according to St. Augustine, "Holy Scripture proposes to us, in an easy and intelligible manner, all that is necessary for our conduct in life, that it explains and clears up itself in revealing clearly to us in some places what has been said obscurely in others, and that this obscurity has its use, if we view it with the eye of faith and piety."

Speaking of charity or love, St. Augustine says, "This is the root, and all the other truths are the branches and the fruits. If you cannot," saith he "comprehend all those branches which

are of so vast extent, satisfy yourselves with the root, which includes the whole. He who loves, knows all, because he possesses the end to which all tends. Say not then you cannot understand the Scripture; love God, and there is nothing which you shall not be able to understand. When the Scripture is clear, it clearly marks the divine love; and when obscure, it marks its obscurity. He, then, knows the clear and obscure in the Scripture who knows the love of God, and who regulates his life by that love."

The translators conclude their preface as follows:—"The New Testament is the treasure of the church, hence a translation is a common good. There is, therefore, ground to hope, that all will take part in what is useful to all, and that humble souls will seek nothing but their own edification in this work; praying God for those who have engaged in it, that he would not impute rashness to this service which they have attempted to render to the church, without sufficiently considering that it was above their strength; that he would cover and repair the faults in the execution, in their not having laboured with all the respect, and all the attention, and all the piety, that they ought; that he would accompany it with the blessing of his Spirit; and that he would not permit any thing strange or human to be mixed, that might turn or change in any manner this impression which the words of grace, truth, and life, ought to have on men's souls."

Thus, it appears, that not only the reverend translators, but the principal saints and fathers of the Church of Rome were Protestants in sentiment, with regard to the reading of the Bible. St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, St. Dennis, and St. Gregory, all of whom are cited as authorities on this subject, speak very much like the fathers of the Church of England, who composed the Homily, on reading the Scriptures. Had the ancient fathers lived in the time of Luther, and found the church so incorrigibly corrupt as she was in his time, they would most probably have joined the Reformation; and had they lived in the present day, they would have joined the Bible Society; for, to use the language of Dr. Milner, they were all infected with the Bible madness, and they spake like downright enthusiasts of the advantage of reading and knowing the Holy Scriptures.

Papists are continually boasting of the antiquity of their religion; but real antiquity is all against them. I wish them to go farther back than any of the saints whose names I have mentioned; I wish them to go as far back as Peter and Paul, and the other Apostles; but if they should even stop short of this, and take up with St. Augustine, or St. Gregory, I venture to assure them, they will then find it their duty to abandon the Council of Trent, and the Pope, and the church which makes it a crime to obey God by reading his word.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXXVIII.

SATURDAY, APRIL 3d, 1819.

THE celebrated Dean Swift having preached a sermon against sleeping in the church, began his application in this manner,—“ These arguments may have weight with men awake ; but what shall we say of the sleeper ? By what means shall we arouse him to a sense of his sin and danger ? ” A reflection like this has occurred to THE PROTESTANT, on looking over what he has written on the subject of the Bible, and the duty of reading it : these arguments, he hopes, will have weight with persons who are awake to the subject ; but what shall he say to the Papist, who is asleep, and worse than asleep ; and who will not allow his mind to open to the consideration of what is infinitely interesting to himself, but which he spurns away from him, as being the business, not of him, but of his priest ? If ever the minds of such shall be opened, it will be the work of God and not of man.

Yet this work may be accomplished by human instrumentality. We know the means by which the priests shut the hearts of the people, and keep them shut, against the light of God’s word. Along with the terror of their persons and office, which they hang over the heads of the people, it is by means of such arguments as I have detailed in some of my late Numbers, taken from the writings of Bishop Milner and others, against the Bible Society, and the circulation of the Scriptures. I believe the best answer to such arguments is to give the Bible itself to those who can read ; but perhaps much good might be done among our Popish population by the distribution of cheap Tracts, recommending the Bible, giving copious extracts from it, and, in a lively summary way, exposing the absurdity of the reasons which the priests give for withholding it from the people. It will be objected, that this would appear like an attempt to make proselytes, and thereby excite alarm among both the people and their priests. What then ? Is it not the desire of every Protestant Christian to win his brother from error and superstition ? We have too much delicacy with regard to our fellow creatures who are living in fatal error, and who, while they continue to reject the gospel of Christ, are in the broad way of destruction.

Would we win them secretly, and by stealth? This would not be honourable in itself, and certainly not like the example set by the Apostles. They told unbelievers plainly, that they were unbelievers; and idolaters, that they were idolaters; and they told them this for the avowed purpose of turning them from vain idols to serve the living God. In this manner should we deal with our Popish neighbours; and if we do so with kindness and affection; if, while we point out the cruelty and wickedness of the priests, who rob the people of the bread of life, we make it manifest that it is not hatred but love to their souls that prompts us, our endeavours will, through the divine blessing, tell upon the conscience and heart of some, perhaps of many individuals, and lead them to renounce the Pope, and the Priest, and all their idols, and embrace the Saviour of sinners.

The distribution of cheap Tracts has been very useful in instructing and awakening ignorant Protestants: and why should not Papists have a similar benefit extended to them, in the form of Tracts, calculated to engage their attention, and to remove their prejudices against the Bible and the gospel which it reveals? They have access, indeed, to all the Tracts that are in circulation, if they please to read them; but then there are few, if any of them, calculated for their meridian, or suited to their modes of thinking. The plainest evangelical Tracts take much for granted which Papists require to be taught; and none of them that I have seen contain the necessary exposure of the folly of what is taught by their priests. I am aware no Bible Society can properly adopt this mode of promoting Christianity, because their business is to distribute the Bible *alone*; but there are Tract Societies, and education societies of various names, by whom this hint may be improved; and if, by any means, we can persuade the adherents of Rome seriously to read the Bible, the reign of superstition and priestcraft will not long maintain its ground before the light of the divine word, which shines in every page of the Bible.

Having finished what I had to say on this subject, I shall now indulge the reader and myself with a few pages of lighter matter.

I feel much gratified in being able to inform my readers, that, through their kind and persevering support, I have been enabled to give fifty pounds for charitable purposes, being profits of *THE PROTESTANT* up to the twentieth Number inclusive. This sum was tendered to the Committee of the Society for the support of Catholic Schools, in Glasgow; but being by them refused, I disposed of it in donations to three Societies, which are eminently entitled to public support, viz. the Hibernian Society, and the Sunday School Society for Ireland, L.20 each; and L.10 to a Sabbath School Society in Glasgow.

I take this opportunity of replying to such of my correspondents as have complained of the high price of *THE PROTESTANT*; and

I hope they will be satisfied when I inform them that, when the allowance to booksellers and other retailers is deducted, together with the expense of distribution, advertising, collecting a great number of small sums from different quarters, postages and parcels from the country, &c., all paid by the publishers, the nett proceeds of each Number is a fraction less than a penny farthing. This is all that remains for paper, printing, and profit; it is out of this small sum that the L.50 has been realized: and if I had sold my Numbers for three half-pence, there would have been a considerable loss. By using coarser paper and a larger type, I might perhaps afford to sell them at the last mentioned price; but I do not think this would be generally agreeable to my readers. It is right to add that I believe those who complain, do it solely from a wish that my work might be more extensively circulated, by being more accessible to the poor. This also is my wish, but I cannot accomplish it without reducing the quality of the paper, and giving less matter in the page, which I would be sorry to do. My readers in general, I hope, will pardon me for introducing so much of the merchant into *THE PROTESTANT*.

I am often asked how is *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR* coming on? and it may be proper to give a short answer to this question, especially as many who read his earlier Numbers have given him up from mere disgust. That the Protestants in this country were very willing to hear a defence of the Church of Rome, if conducted upon the principles of fair reasoning, is abundantly evident, from the ready sale of the first and second Numbers of *THE VINDICATOR*; but when they found that there was neither truth nor reason in him, most of them thought proper to leave him to those to whom the opposite might be acceptable.

As a general answer to the question, how is he coming on? let it suffice, that the poor man is extremely angry: that he is even swearing with passion; for which, see his seventh Number, column 108, in which he begins a sentence with an oath: that great part of his work has little relation to the facts and arguments of the Protestant, but exhibits a ludicrous combat with phantoms of his own raising: that, with all his folly, he has sense enough to see that I am aiming at the vitals of his system; and, therefore, he uses every species of provoking and insulting language and accuses me of many bad things, in order to divert me from my purpose, and set me upon my own defence, or engage me in a contest about miserably distorted scraps of history. Though I avowedly take my stand upon the Bible alone, and am the advocate of no sect or party, he will have it, that I am responsible for all the errors and crimes which he chooses to say have been committed in Protestant countries, by parliaments, armies, thief-catchers, and others, though they were persons who had no religion at all; and when he has dilated at sufficient length upon these subjects he thinks he has repelled every charge against

his own church, by whatever evidence it has been established. His work, with all its faults, seems to be in great favour with persons of his own sect here, from the industry with which they puff it off by means of hand-bills, which, every week, deface the corners of our streets, and the gates of our churches,* headed by great capitals, announcing *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*, with its contents for the week; which contents, by the bye, usually contain more than the work itself; for they announce the refutation of this, and the refutation of that, whereas, in the book, there is nothing refuted. The deplorable state of intellect and of taste which must exist among the admirers of such a work, excites, I hope, in the breast of every Protestant, a feeling of gratitude for the blessings of the Reformation; yet Mr. Andrews will be as much astonished at my want of intellect and of taste in disparaging his style of writing, as any Hottentot beauty would be, on finding her charms disparaged by some barbarous European.

A blundering officer in a camp will sometimes very effectually, though unconsciously, serve the cause of his enemy. In this way I still hail Mr. Andrews as an auxiliary; for, with all his boasting and bluster, he lays open, from time to time, the vulnerable parts of the cause which he undertakes to defend, in such a way as will make my work easy when I come to reply to his declamations.

He has laboured hard to vindicate his church against the accusation of holding it lawful to break faith with heretics. Yet the matter stands just as I left it, as any one may see who will take the pains to read carefully and compare what has been written on both sides. This, it must be allowed, he has rendered somewhat difficult by an immense mass of irrelevant matter, which serves, in a great measure, to cover and conceal the real question at issue. Yet if any of my readers find it possible to muster up as much patience as to make the comparison between my evidences and his replies, I am very well assured they will find the charge established. To this subject I intend to address myself, at some future period; but I will not gratify Mr. Andrews so far as to deviate from my own plan to reply to him, farther than what he will find in this Number.

Whatever may be the public avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, it is evident that Mr. Andrews himself holds, in substance, that of which I accused his church, namely, the

* Mr. Andrews tells us, in his *Orthodox Journal* for October last, page 374, "that civil liberty is not the offspring of Protestantism, nor has she even been permitted to abide wherever the light of the Reformation has dawned." He uses the words, "light of the Reformation," in derision. Now I would ask him, what would be the consequence, if *THE PROTESTANT* were to publish his work in Spain, and have the contents of it stuck up on the church gates every Sunday morning, to insult the devout worshippers of the Virgin Mary? Let him answer this question, and say where the balance in favour of liberty would lie.

lawfulness of breaking promises, and, by a little stretch of the principle, the lawfulness of violating oaths; for promises and oaths are only different degrees of the same thing. The promise of an honest man is as binding as his oath. He feels it so; and when he is lawfully called to confirm his word with an oath, he does it for the satisfaction of others, not for the purpose of binding himself more firmly.

NOW THE VINDICATOR actually pleads the lawfulness of breaking promises, that is, breaking faith, in at least five different cases, for which see his twelfth and thirteenth Numbers, in which he justifies and defends the immoral principles of Bishop Lanigan, contained in his letter, quoted in my twenty-ninth Number. The doctrine there laid down appears to him a thing so indisputable, that he presumes Protestants to hold the same. Now, though nobody denies, what he labours through many a long page to prove,—that many wicked men, called Protestants, have broken their promises; yet I maintain, and I am sure every honest man will agree with me, that it is not lawful, in any case whatever, for a man to break a promise voluntarily made, if it does not bind him to commit sin. And, even in this case, he ought not to break it lightly or hastily; but on solemn consideration, and deep repentance before God, for having made such a promise, together with adequate compensation if any person came innocently to be injured by it. But Dr. Lanigan lays it down as a principle, or doctrine taught by great divines and saints of the Church of Rome, with St. Thomas Aquinas at their head, that it is lawful to break promises in all the different cases which he has stated: particularly, that it is lawful to do so on a change of circumstances; no matter what loss may be sustained by the person to whom the promise is made; his interest is out of the question; the promiser is the sole judge with regard to the change of circumstances, and what is best for his own interest. If it be alleged, that it is understood that the promiser shall have the consent of the other party, I answer, it is no such thing; for that forms a case by itself, and is the third upon the Bishop's list: but, in the fifth case, on a change of circumstances, the promiser acts for himself alone, and sets the other party at defiance, as Lanigan did in his own case, upon the authority of the rule laid down by St. Thomas and other canonists.*

* It seems the most redoubted and most orthodox Dr. Milner had a hand in this promise-breaking; and Mr. Andrews, no doubt, finds himself obliged to defend any thing in which his oracle and idol is concerned. "Dr. Lanigan had promised to sign for the concession of the veto; but, in consequence of Dr. Milner's influence and instructions, he retracted, and published his celebrated apology, in which he gave five reasons why a promise might be broken: and that, at all events, the promise he made, though a serious, was not a solemn one; and, therefore, according to his maxims, not binding." *History of the Jesuits, &c.* 1816. vol. I. p. 138.

Now Mr. Andrews seriously defends this principle ; and he maintains that THE PROTESTANT would act upon it too, if he found it for his interest. See *Cath. Vind.* col. 203. In short it seems to him incomprehensible that any man should act otherwise, which shows that he has no distinct ideas of common honesty. As if conscious of nothing but obliquity in his own mind, he has no conception of rectitude in the mind of another. He supposes a case of an agent sending a man such goods as he has *not* ordered ; and he pleads this as a case in which the person who gave the order might lawfully break his promise, and refuse to accept his correspondent's bill ; and, by thus shuffling from one thing to another, he attempts to evade the natural consequence of which I had convicted his principle, of breaking a promise, in relation to goods which a man *had ordered*. This is a disingenuous trick, quite worthy of a man who writes not to instruct but to deceive his readers ; and I suppose the Popish part of them are so blind as not to see through it. If they did, they would not identify themselves with him, as they do by applauding and circulating his work. It is painful to think that the Papists in this country, in general, hold the same standard of moral obligation that is held by their organ and advocate ; and yet I see not how they can acquit themselves, but by publicly disavowing him and his work.

Again Bishop Lanigan teaches, on the same high authority, that the obligation arising from a promise ceases, "when a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made." Here, as in the other case, the promiser is the sole judge of what would be pernicious or useless. Suppose a Papist to have received a great sum of money in trust, under a promise to make it over to a certain young man, on his coming of age ; and finding that the possession of a large fortune would be pernicious to the young man, he might lawfully break his promise, and apply the money to build a monastery, or do whatever he pleased with it. Those who are acquainted with the practices of the Jesuits, will not consider this an extravagant supposition, or improbable case.

It was, no doubt, on some such principle that the Rev. Peter Gandolphy satisfied his conscience. He promised publicly, and in print, that if any Society would furnish him and his brethren with copies of the Bible in their own English version, with or *without* notes, they would receive and distribute them. The said Priest, however, broke his promise almost as publicly as he had made it ; finding, perhaps, upon reflection, as he actually maintained in argument, that the distribution of the Bible *without* notes, that is, the keeping of his promise, would be pernicious to those on whose behalf it was made.

These principles, publicly taught from the Episcopal chair in Ireland, and defended by the organ of English Papists in London, have done more to show me the danger of admitting Papists to places of power and trust, than all that I ever read

against what is called Catholic emancipation. I request my readers not to take their opinion of these principles from my commentary, but from the very words of Bishop Lanigan himself, and of Mr. Andrews, their defender; let them take the words as they stand,—let them study their import,—let them reflect that, in four of the five cases, the man who has made a promise is the sole judge of the propriety of breaking it; and let them say whether the principles thus distinctly avowed and defended are not subversive of all the laws of moral obligation.

Suppose a few Papists were returned members of Parliament, a thing that would soon happen, if emancipation were granted to them. They would have to swear, indeed, to support and defend our Protestant Constitution; but when they had got possession of their seats, they would find the “circumstances” completely “changed;” they would find themselves now a part of the Constitution; they would find it lawful to break their oaths, for breaking oaths and breaking promises are only different degrees of the same thing; and they would find themselves bound, by every possible means, to promote the interest of their church, whatever might become of our Protestant Constitution.

These ideas are confirmed by the weekly and monthly publications of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. No Westminster demagogue can write with more asperity against the measures of government, or declaim with greater volubility about the miserable and *enslaved* state of our country. It is no part of my business, in a controversy about religion, either to approve, or to condemn political measures; and it would be no part of his business, if he would confine himself to the question of religion: but he cannot forbear abusing our Protestant government. He speaks of the Stuarts, particularly Charles I. as if they were the most amiable and tolerant princes that ever reigned. He speaks with the greatest abhorrence of those who opposed the arbitrary measures of that infatuated family. He does not, in plain words, condemn the Revolution of 1688, and the Hanoverian succession; but he condemns the principles on which they are founded; and, in the Orthodox Journal, he labours, at great length, to show that the kingdom was much more free and happy before that event, than it has been since. Nay, he tells us pretty plainly, that matters will not be right until all that was done at the Revolution be undone, together with all that has been done since. In his Journal for October last, p. 376, he quotes from a declaration of the Birmingham Hampden club, which “loudly demands a return to the *ancient* practice of the Constitution,” that is, “in *Catholic times*,” as Mr. Andrews is pleased to inform us. From this it is evident that if such men as he were in parliament, they would labour to restore the ancient state of things. Then farewell to our Protestant Constitution, and the Hanoverian succession.—No matter though these men had sworn to support and defend the Constitution as it is. They are taught by the casuistry of St. Thomas Aquinas, and Bishop Lanigan, with the approba-

tion of Mr. Andrews himself, that it is lawful to break a promise, and, by a little extension of the same principle, an oath, when circumstances are changed, and when the keeping of the promise or oath would be pernicious or useless; and what can be so pernicious in the eye of a Papist, as to support a government that is opposed to the establishment of the "Catholic faith?"

My readers know that I have meddled very little with the political question of what is called Catholic emancipation; and I would not likely have touched upon it now, in this general reference to the writings of my opponent, were not he incessantly obtruding it upon his readers, and railing against our government for withholding from Papists a place in that Constitution, which, he says, was framed by their ancestors; insinuating pretty plainly, that the kingdom is theirs in point of right, and that they will not be satisfied till they have it in possession. Something of this appears here and there in *THE VINDICATOR*, but not nearly so much as the same writer exhibits in his *Orthodox Journal*, in which, with singular effrontery, he abuses our government under its own eye, in the very pages in which he is endeavouring to prove that Popery is more favourable to liberty than the religion of Protestants.

There are few things which I abhor so much as accusing persons of sedition and treason, on account of their religion. This was the practice of the enemies of Christ and his Apostles. It was the practice of heathen Rome; and it has been the practice of Papal Rome, from the time of the Waldenses down to the days of Eusebius Andrews, who deals out, with an unsparing hand, accusations of treason and sedition against men of whom the world was not worthy,—who were really the best friends of their king and of their country,—to whom we are indebted for both our civil and religious liberty, and to whom *THE VINDICATOR* himself is indebted for the liberty of railing against the government of his country. This, he will say, is mere assertion. Be it so: it is at least as good as his assertion to the contrary; and it will be proved, without difficulty, when I enter seriously upon the subject.

No man can justly accuse him of sedition or treason, on account of religion; for it does not appear that he possesses any thing worthy of the name. His declamations are almost entirely of a political character. What he demands for the adherents of the Pope, is not freedom of religious worship, but political power; and while, in doing so, he explicitly avows principles that are subversive of those laws of moral obligation which bind society together; while he abuses our established government, and the principles on which it is founded; and while he acts as the organ of thousands of discontented and intriguing Papists in Britain and Ireland, I do him no injustice when I point out the tendency of his writings; and when I warn my countrymen of what they may expect, if persons holding such principles shall come to have power and authority in this Protestant country.

THE

Protestant,

No. XXXIX.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10th, 1819.

IN discussing the subject of the Church of Rome withholding the Bible from the people, I find I made a mistake which I hasten to rectify. I proceeded upon the idea that it was a principle admitted on both sides, that the Bible was the word of God. This fundamental principle I took for granted, not aware that it would be denied by modern Papists. I find, however, it is in effect denied by their organ, *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*; and I have no reason to think that he does not speak the sentiments of the general body. In his fifteenth Number, which I did not see till after my last was in the Printers' hands, he speaks as if he were surprised that I should unhesitatingly assure my readers "that the Scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven; that they contain a complete revelation of his will, for the salvation of our fallen race; that, in short, the Bible is the word of God addressed to his own creatures." I acknowledge that I did say all this; and *THE VINDICATOR* lays it down to be controverted, though he has not yet said much in the way of refutation, further than challenging me to say how I came to the knowledge of the above truth. Towards the conclusion of the same Number, he repeats part of the above, together with a further declaration of *THE PROTESTANT*, that that part of the Bible which is called the gospel, is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners; which declaration surprises him so much, that he exclaims, "What nonsense!"

I am glad that I have driven my opponent off the sacred ground of divine revelation, and compelled him to avow his infidelity. I would have rejoiced much more if I had succeeded in bringing him to submit to the word and the righteousness of God for his own salvation; but since he does reject, and declare to be nonsense, the gospel of Christ as a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, he acts more like an honest

man by rejecting the Bible, than by professing to believe it. Now, therefore, I consider him, and those who adhere to him and admire his writings, in the light of mere heathens and idolaters. I shall proceed to discuss the subject of their idolatry, and to show its conformity with ancient heathenism, from which it was undoubtedly derived.

It is a first principle of Christianity, that there is one only living and true God; and that *HE alone* is the proper object of religious worship. The language of Jehovah, the God of Israel, to his people is, "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt worship *only me*." Divine worship, therefore, offered to any other, is direct rebellion against him. It is marked by the prophet Jeremiah, as one of the grossest instances of the idolatry of the children of Israel, in imitation of their heathen neighbours, that they worshipped an idol whom they called the queen of heaven, (Jer. vii. 18. xliv. 17—19.) Now this is actually a title which is given by the Church of Rome to one of her principal idols, namely, the Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There can be no doubt that the mother of our Lord, according to the flesh, was blessed among women. From all that is recorded of her, however, it is evident that her blessedness arose not only or chiefly from the mere circumstance of her being the mother of Jesus, but from her being a partaker of that grace which is extended to all Christians alike. Mary makes no great figure in the evangelical history; and when she is brought into view, it seems intended rather to repress than to cherish any idea of her being preferred before other followers of Christ. Indeed, when she is brought into view, one is apt to wonder that so little account is made of her; but the Spirit of God, no doubt foreseeing that she would be made an object of idolatrous worship, so ordered matters, that nothing should be done to her, or said of her, that should give the smallest countenance to such impiety.

In the Church of Rome, however, she is as really an object of worship, as Diana was in Ephesus, or Venus in Paphos, or any other god or goddess in any heathen nation in the world. I hope to prove this at great length, before I finish this part of my subject; but, as an introduction to it, I shall quote the history of this idol as given by the Rhemish translators of the New Testament, who, no doubt, give the true doctrine of the church on the subject.

Annotation on Acts i. 14. "Mary the mother of Jesus.] This is the last mention that is made in Scripture of our lady; for though she was full of all divine wisdom, and opened (no doubt) unto the Evangelists and other writers of holy Scriptures, divers of Christ's actions, speeches, and mysteries, where-

of she had both experimental and revealed knowledge : yet, for that she was a woman, and the humblest creature living, and the pattern of all order and obedience, it pleased not God that there should be any farther note of her life, doings, or death, in the Scriptures. She lived the rest of her time with the Christians (as here is peculiarly noted and named among them), and specially with S. John the Apostle, to whom our Lord recommended her, who provided for her all necessities ; her spouse, Joseph (as may be thought) being deceased before. The common opinion is, that she lived 63 years in all. At the time of her death, (as S. Dennis first, and after him S. Damascene, *de dormit Deipara* writeth) all the Apostles, then dispersed into diverse nations to preach the gospel, were miraculously brought together (saving S. Thomas, who came the third day after) to Jerusalem, to honour her divine departure and funeral, as the said S. Dennis witnesseth, who saith that himself, S. Timothy, and S. Hierotheus were present, testifying also of his own hearing, that both before her death, and after for three days, not only the Apostles and other holy men present, but the angels also, and powers of heaven, did sing most melodious hymns. They buried her sacred body in Gethsemane ; but, for S. Thomas's sake, who desired to see and reverence it, they opened the sepulchre the third day, and finding it void of the holy body, but exceedingly fragrant, they returned, assuredly deeming that her body was assumed into heaven, as the church of God holdeth, being most agreeable to the singular privilege of the mother of God, and, therefore, celebrated most solemnly the day of her assumption. And this is consonant not only to the said S. Dennis, and S. Damascene, but to holy Athanasius also, who avoucheth the same, *Serm. in Evang. de Deipara* ; of which assumption of her body S. Bernard also wrote five notable sermons extant in his works."

Here is laid the foundation of the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary, a poor mortal creature, who owed her own salvation to free grace, like any other sinner who believed in the Saviour. The inventive fancy of some early fathers, found out that all the Apostles were miraculously assembled to witness her death, except Thomas, who, it seems, had a practice of being out of the way. Mary having been buried, arose again the third day, and was assumed, that is, taken up into heaven, as Christ had been ; from which it was inferred, that she is raised to the same glory with him, and that she is to be worshipped : this, at least, is the practical inference which has been drawn from the doctrine, for many hundred years. The Rhemish doctors proceed as follows, to censure and condemn the Protestants, who will not fall down and worship the idol which the Church of Rome has set up :—

“ But neither these holy fathers, nor the church's tradition and testimony, do bear any sway now-a-days with the Protestants, that have abolished this her greatest feast of her assumption ; who of reason should, at the least, celebrate it as the day of her death, as they do of other saints. For though they believe not that her body is assumed, yet they will not (we trow) deny that she is dead, and her soul in glory ; neither can they ask Scripture for that, no more than they require for the deaths of Peter, Paul, John, and others, which be not mentioned in Scriptures, and yet are still celebrated by the Protestants. But concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, they have blotted out, also, both her nativity and conception ; so that it may be thought the devil beareth a special malice to this woman, whose seed broke his head. For as for the other two days of her purification and annunciation, they be not proper to our lady, but the one to Christ's conception, the other to his presentation ; so that she, by this means, shall have no festival at all.

“ But, contrariwise, to consider how the ancient church and fathers esteemed, spake, and wrote of this excellent vessel of grace, may make us detest these men's impiety, that cannot abide the praises of her whom all generations shall call blessed, and that esteem her honours a derogation to her Son. Some of their speeches we will set down, that all men may see that we neither praise her, nor pray to her, more amply than they did. S. Athanasius, in the place alleged, after he had declared how all the angelic spirits, and every order of them, honoured and praised her with the *Ave*, wherewith S. Gabriel saluted her : ‘ we also,’ saith he, ‘ of all degrees upon the earth, extol thee, with loud voice, saying, *Ave, gratia plena*, &c. Hail, full of grace. our Lord is with thee, pray for us, O mistress, and lady, and queen, and mother of God.’ Most holy and ancient Ephrem, also, in a special oration made in praise of our lady, saith thus, in divers places thereof, ‘ *Intemerata Deipara*, &c. Mother of God, undefiled, queen of all, the hope of them that despair, my lady most glorious, higher than the heavenly spirits, more honourable than the cherubims, holier than the seraphims, and without comparison more glorious than the supernal hosts, the hope of the fathers, the glory of the prophets, the praise of the Apostles.’ And a little after, ‘ *Virgo ante partum, in partu, et post partum*, by thee we are reconciled to Christ my God, thy Son : thou art the helper of sinners, thou the haven of them that are tossed with storms, the solace of the world, the deliverer of the imprisoned, the helper of orphans, the redemption of captives.’ And afterwards, ‘ Vouchsafe me, thy servant, to praise thee. Hail, Mary, full of grace ; hail virgin, most blessed among women.’ And much more in that sense, which were too long to repeat.

“ S. Cyril hath the like wonderful speeches of her honour. *Hom. 6. contra Nestorium.* ‘ Praise and glory be to thee, O Holy Trinity : to thee also be praise. O mother of God ; for thou art the precious pearl of the world ; thou the candle of unquenchable light ; the crown of virginity ; the sceptre of the catholic faith. By thee the Trinity is glorified and adored in all the world ; by thee heaven rejoiceth, angels and archangels are glad, devils are put to flight, and man is called again to heaven, and every creature that was held with the errors of idols, is turned to the knowledge of the truth : by thee churches are founded through the world ; thee being their helper, the gentiles come to penance ;’ *and much more which we omit.* Likewise the Greek liturgies, or masses of S. James, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom, make most honourable mention of our blessed lady, praying unto her, saluting her with the angelic hymn, *Ave, Maria*, and using these speeches : ‘ Most holy, undefiled, blessed above all, our queen, our lady, the mother of God, Mary, a virgin for ever, the sacred ark of Christ’s incarnation, broader than the heavens that didst bear thy Creator : holy mother, of unspeakable light, we magnify thee with angelic hymns. All things pass understanding ; all things are glorious in thee, O mother of God. By thee the mystery before unknown to the angels is made manifest and revealed on the earth. Thou art more honourable than the cherubims, and more glorious than the seraphims. To thee, O full of grace, all creatures, both men and angels, do gratulate and rejoice. Glory be to thee, which art a sanctified temple, a spiritual paradise, the glory of virgins, of whom God took flesh, and made thy womb his throne, &c.’ ”

There is another long paragraph to the same purpose, containing the words of St. Augustine, or of St. Fulgentius, for the translators are not sure which ; then of St. Damascene, and St. Ireneus, all puffing off the Virgin Mary as above the celestial hosts, as being the special hope of sinners, &c. &c. Fulke endeavours to show that some of the saints above named never wrote any thing like what is ascribed to them, but that these things were forged in their names, hundreds of years after their death ; and I have no doubt this is the fact, for the worship of creatures, that is of idols, was by no means general in the church for a long time after the death of some of the fathers, who are here cited as recommending and practising the worship of the Virgin Mary. Be that as it may, the Popish fathers of Rheims, who were the first to give their brethren in England a version of the New Testament, in their own language, gave it with a strong recommendation of the Virgin Mary as an object of worship, as the hope of the guilty, as the refuge of the afflicted, and as a powerful intercessor with her Son for obtaining every blessing.

If the subject were not shocking for its impiety, it would be amusing to observe the shifts to which the reverend fathers are reduced, in order to support the credit of their idol. They admit that it pleased not God to give any further account of the history of Mary in the Scriptures, than what we have there recorded. Christians would rest in such information as it pleased God to give; but this is not the case with our Rhemish translators. It has pleased *them* to relate what God did not think proper to make known; and for what they have related, they have no authority whatever, but the ravings of distempered imaginations of idle monks, who amused themselves in their solitude by composing such wild reveries, and imposing them upon the world as revelations from heaven. Such reveries, however, are received by our English Papists as the dictates of infallible truth, and the Virgin Mary is worshipped with greater devotion than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This I will prove before I leave the subject, by giving the prayers which are actually addressed to her, from some of their books of devotion. In the meantime, I shall give some account of another idol not so generally known, that is, the mother of the Virgin Mary.

I give the following extracts from "An Abridgement of the Prerogatives of St. Ann, mother of the Mother of God;" which has the approbation of the doctors (of the Sorbonne) at Paris, London 1688. If my readers should feel shocked by the grossness and impiety of it, I can truly say that I sympathize with them; and that, though I feel it my duty to expose the abominable wickedness of Popery, I have no pleasure in making such an exposure as the following:—

"Chap. 2d. She (St. Ann) was the mother of the mother of God, and the grandmother of God himself. Figure to yourself, chaste spouse of Jesus Christ, a royal eagle flies from mountain to mountain, to choose a tree which may serve the design, to feed there and breed her young ones. Imagine now that God is this eagle, who, running over with his eyes, as it were, so many beautiful trees, all the women who were to be from the first to the last, perceived not any one so worthy to receive the glorious Virgin, who was to be the little nut of the heavenly eaglet, who is the Word incarnate, as St. Ann, in whom he rested himself as in the tree of paradise, which he knew to be the tallest in devotion, the deepest in humility, the largest in charity, and of the most pleasant odour in sanctity. So if, in one word, you would know the price of that crown which St. Ann bore on earth and in heaven, it must be said, and this is to say all, that her treasure and her crown was the giving *being* to *her* who gave it to God; which is to be crowned with the merits of Mary, like the tree with its flowers and fruit.

“ Whence it is to be concluded, that the dignity, the grace, and the holiness of this *only*, and only perfect daughter, ought to reflect back on her mother, even to a point. That she rendered her incomparable in sanctity, as she was in her dignity; for of two things, one must of necessity happen, either that this holy Virgin had not the power, or that having the power, she communicated to her whatever we can fancy greater in grace. Her paps have too much credit and access with the Word, her Son, not to have the power, who being, in the terms of Clement of Alexandria, the pap of his heavenly Father, which gave fecundity to all nature, would also as he had been the principle of the universe, by being *mamelle de son Pere*, the Virgin should be *his*, (but yet not without proportion) and a force to establish a world of grace, to make saints, and to make them worthy of glory. So that it is true, in some sort, and good divinity to say, that the felicity of the saints is derived from Mary, and that there is nobody who is not obliged to her for the fortification of his patience, for the victory over his temptations, for preservation from falls, for augmentation of his merits, for his final grace, and finally for his glory.

“ This principle supposed, who will doubt that St. Ann was not the masterpiece of Mary’s workmanship, and that the power of this last was not the measure of the excellence of the former? And it is one of the greatest miracles of mysteries of our religion, that the children give life to their parents, and those who are not yet, give admirable advantage to those who already are. Thus Jesus is the son of Adam according to nature, and his father according to grace;—the Virgin is the mother of the Saviour, by the shadowing of the Holy Spirit; and is likewise the eldest daughter to the Redeemer. Thus, St. Ann is in the state of grace, the daughter of her daughter, the holy Virgin, by a plenitude of grace which she from her received. Which ought not to be thought strange by him who has tasted the sense and universal consent of the fathers, who assert, that what was given in *plenitude* to Christ, ought in *proportion* to be attributed to the holy Virgin.

“ The glory of Jesus Christ, the fourth reason of the prerogatives of St. Ann, requires, that St. Ann should be such, to be his worthy grandmother. St. Ann having been chosen in the ideas of eternal predestination to be the grandmother of Jesus Christ; ought not this step to comprehend as many excellences as demonstrate the sublimeness of this saint’s perfection? There need be used only the dignity of her name, as grandmother of Jesus Christ. An argument which the Apostle uses to prove the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ above the angelic natures, for that he was the Son of God. The dignity, therefore

of St. Ann, that having entered by the conception and nativity of the Virgin, into the economy of the incarnation, and into the state of the hypostatical union, she was by this her daughter exalted into so dazzling a throne of glory, that there is only above it, the Trinity of uncreated persons, the humanity of Jesus Christ, and the holiness of her daughter, Mother of God.— In our indigences and our needs, we must address ourselves by St. Ann to the Virgin, and by the Virgin to Jesus Christ, and by Jesus Christ to God the Father, who can refuse nothing to his Son, no more than He can to his Mother, or she to her's, who is St. Ann."

Then follows a prayer addressed to the said St. Ann, which will be introduced with more propriety when I come to give specimens of the style of devotion used in the Church of Rome, in the worship of her idols. The work from which the above extracts are made, has the approbation of the doctors in divinity in the faculty in Paris, who declare that they think it worthy to be published; and a certificate to this effect is signed at Paris, the 10th July, 1643, by "Vincent Jude, C. Bourbon."

As an introduction to what I have to write on the subject of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, I thought it proper to give this short history of their principal idol, and of her mother, in the very words of their own writers; and if it shall be said that this account is too much like what heathen authors have written about the genealogy of their gods and goddesses, I have only to reply, that I cannot help it. They have chosen such idols for themselves, and such is the account which their authors give of them.

I had marked off for insertion here, Mr. ANDREWS' account of the Virgin Mary; but as I have not room for the whole, and as it would not be doing him justice to cut it through the middle, I reserve it for my next; and conclude the present Number with the following anecdote, which came to my knowledge since I finished what I had to say on the subject of withholding the Bible from the people.

An English officer, who was lately in Valenciennes, states the following fact, which came under his own observation. A number of Bibles, in French, had been sent from England to the above city, for sale or distribution. Many of the people received them with gratitude, and read them with avidity; but the priests getting information of the matter, ordered all the Bibles to be returned. The English officer, who was acquainted with him, asked the reason of this: to which he gave this truly *Catholic* reply;—"I teach the people every thing that is necessary for them to know."

THE

Protestant,

No. XL.

SATURDAY, APRIL 17th, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us that "it would be almost endless to answer all the charges which THE PROTESTANT may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against Popery." (Part I. p. 30.) I suppose the writer refers to Luther, Calvin, and Knox, as the original declaimers against Popery; and, when he compares THE PROTESTANT to such men, he probably intends it as a compliment; and as such, no doubt, it ought to be received with all due acknowledgment.

In point of fact, however, there is no subject with regard to which fertility of genius is less necessary. It scarcely admits of imagination at all. The only faculty that is necessary for the investigation of such a subject, is patience. The materials, by which the Church of Rome is convicted of all the bad things which I have laid to her charge, are so abundant, that there is no room for invention, or the exercise of imagination. If I am so happy as to possess this faculty, I suppose my readers will not easily find it out from any thing that I have written; but, if they knew the quantity of blasphemous and impure matter which I am obliged to turn over, in exploring the writings of Romish saints and fathers, in order to exhibit the true character of Popery, they would, I am sure, give me credit for some degree of patience. It would be easy to find enough to fill some ponderous folios: the difficulty is to select and condense such matter as will engage general attention, in this age of light and superficial reading.

I have undertaken to prove the Church of Rome guilty of idolatry: and so far from being at a loss for matter,—so far from being obliged to have recourse to the fertility of genius, I feel that, amidst the variety of subjects which claim attention, it is difficult to decide which to present to my readers first. In my last Number, I gave a particular account of two of Rome's female idols: namely, the Virgin Mary, upon the authority of the learned doctors of Rheims; and the mother of the said Mary, from a work approved by the doctors of the Sorbonne, at Paris: but, lest

it should be pleaded, that these authorities are obsolete, and that more rational sentiments are now entertained, (for Papists can change their sentiments often enough, and disavow the sentiments of their fathers, when they have a purpose to serve,) I shall give the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as held in the present day, in the words of Mr. Andrews, in his school book, which has the high *apostolical* sanction and recommendation of Bishop Milner, "than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed."

"Of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

'One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is devotion to the blessed Virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it, because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession in the sight of God for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation.

"Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, it is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God ever created.

"By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him. She is all goodness in regard of us, by applying to God for us. Being mother of God, he cannot refuse her request: being our mother, she cannot deny us her intercession, when we have recourse to her. Our miseries move her; our necessities urge her; the prayers we offer her for our salvation bring to us all that we desire: and St. Bernard is not afraid to say, 'That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effects of her assistance.'

"Although the blessed Virgin extends her goodness to all men, yet we may say she has a particular regard for young people, whose frailty she knows to be the greatest, and necessities the most urgent, especially for the preservation of chastity, which is most assaulted in that age, and of which she is a singular protectress. History is full of examples of saints who have preserved this great virtue in their youth, by the assistance of this queen of virgins, and experience affords daily examples of those who have gained great victories, by the recourse they have had to her intercession, and who have happily advanced themselves in virtue, under the protection, and by the graces she obtains of God for them.

"Be therefore devout to the blessed Virgin, dear Theotime; but let it not be the devotion of many, who think themselves so, in offering some prayer to her, more by custom than devotion; and on the other side exceedingly displease her by a life full of

mortal sin, which they commit without remorse. What devotion is this, to desire to please the mother, and daily crucify the Son, trampling his blood under their feet, and contemning his grace and favour? Is not this to be an enemy both to Son and mother?

“ O dear Theotime, your devotion to the blessed Virgin must not be like that, it must be more generous and more holy; and to speak plainly, if you will be a true child, and a sincere servant of the blessed Virgin, you must be careful to perform four things:

“ 1. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonouring her Son, and destroying your soul; and if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor, in reconciling you to her Son, whom you have extremely provoked. ‘ She is the refuge of sinners as well as of the just, on condition they have recourse to her with a true desire of converting themselves,’ as St. Bernard says.

“ 2. Love and imitate her virtues, principally her humility and chastity. These two virtues among others rendered her most pleasing to God; she loves them particularly in children, and is pleased to assist with her prayers those whom she finds particularly inclined to those virtues, according to the same saint.

“ 3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities: and for that end offer to her daily some particular prayers, say your beads, or the little office sometimes in the week, perform something in her honour on every Saturday, whether prayer, abstinence, or alms; honour particularly her feasts, by confession and communion.

“ 4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourselves in of offending God. You cannot show your respect better than by applying yourself to her in these urgent necessities, and you can find no succour more ready and favourable than hers. It is the counsel of St. Bernard, ‘ If the winds of temptations be raised against you, if you run upon the rocks of adversity, lift up your eyes towards that star, invoke the blessed Virgin. In dangers, in extremities, in doubtful affairs, think upon the blessed Virgin, let her not depart from your mouth, nor from your heart; and that you may obtain the assistance of her intercession, be sure to follow her example.’

“ If you perform this, you will have a true devotion to the blessed Virgin, you will be of the number of her real children, and she will be your mother, under whose protection you shall never perish. Remember well that excellent sentence of St. Anselm, who presumed to say, ‘ That as he must unavoidably perish who has no affection to the blessed Virgin Mary, and who forsakes her; so it is impossible he should perish who has recourse to her, and whom she regards with the eyes of mercy.’

"I shall conclude with an excellent example which I shall produce for a proof of this truth. St. Bridget had a son who followed the profession of a soldier, and died in the wars. Hearing the news of his death, she was much concerned for the salvation of her son, dead in so dangerous a condition: and as she was often favoured by God with revelations of which she has composed a book, she was assured of the salvation of her son by two subsequent revelations. In the first, the blessed Virgin revealed to her, that she had assisted her son with a particular protection at the hour of death, having strengthened him against temptations, and obtained all necessary graces for him to make a holy and happy end. In the following, she declared the cause of that singular assistance she gave her son, and said, it was in recompense of his great and sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life, wherein he had loved her with a very ardent affection, and had endeavoured to please her in all things.

"This, Theotime, is what real devotion to the blessed Virgin did merit for this young man, and for many others: she will be as powerful in your behalf, if you have a devotion to her; if you love and honour the blessed Virgin in the manner we have mentioned."

Such is the doctrine of my opponent, *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*; and such, we may presume, is the doctrine of modern Papists, not only in Spain, but in enlightened England, and even in enlightened Glasgow. Such is the doctrine which, by the authority and recommendation of a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic, is taught in the "Catholic schools" in England, for the purpose of training up the rising generation, not to the knowledge of Christ and his gospel, but to the worship of a vain idol: for let it be remembered that this school book is declared, in the author's *Orthodox Journal*, to be so excellent, that one will learn more of religion from it, at a single reading, than he will derive from the Bible, in a whole life.

Now I defy all the heathens in the whole world, to produce from the writings of their poets or priests, a piece of more direct idol worship than that furnished by Mr. Andrews, which is recommended by Bishop Milner, and inculcated upon the infant minds of those who are taught to read, in the schools of English Papists. The religion of such is unquestionably that of heathenism and idolatry; for it is the knowledge of religion which this book is said to be eminently calculated to impart; and this religion is the worship of a fellow creature. It is to no purpose to reply that, in the same book, the existence of a supreme Deity is admitted; and that he also is to be worshipped. Idolatry consists not so much in denying this truth, as in giving to a creature that worship which is due to God alone.

Mr. Andrews invests this idol with the attributes of a deity. The Virgin Mary must be omniscient: she must see and know the hearts and thoughts of all that worship her; she must know

the particular temptation to which every young man and woman is exposed, that she may provide a remedy to preserve them from sin. She must be omnipresent, to hear the prayers, and answer the requests of all that call upon her; and she must be omnipotent, to preserve the lives of those who trust in her; or, if she should not choose to do this, on all occasions, she must have power over all the spirits of darkness, so that not one of them shall touch the soul of one that dies calling upon her, in any part of the world. Common sense tells us that one, to whom prayer is addressed by millions of needy creatures, with a belief that such prayers are heard, and will be answered, must be present every where, must know all things, and must have almighty power, to do all that his worshippers call on him for. Such knowledge and power belong to the living and true God, and to him alone. To ascribe such perfection to a creature, and to worship a creature, is that very idolatry, and opposition to the authority of the true God, of which the Almighty declares his abhorrence throughout the Bible, for which he sent his ancient church into captivity in Babylon; and for which he has not only sent the Church of Rome into a worse captivity, but has made her the antitype of that very Babylon itself, and the oppressor of the true church of God.

To trust in God for salvation, or for any spiritual blessing, is one of the highest acts of religious worship. He positively challenges this for himself; and pronounces a curse upon the man that trusts in any other. "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord: for he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited. Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is," &c. Jer. xvii. 5—8. But Mr. Andrews urgently advises his young pupils to trust in a woman, not only for the preservation of their chastity, but also as a sure refuge to which they may fly in a dying hour.

If it shall be said, that this is rather implied than plainly expressed by Mr. Andrews, I shall proceed to cite other authorities, in which it is expressed plainly enough. The following short prayer to the Virgin Mary is extracted from a book of devotion, entitled, the "Garden of the Soul," which is, I believe, ascribed to the late Dr. Challoner, a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic in England. "Holy Mary, succour the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex: let all be sensible of *thy help*, who celebrate thy holy commemoration. V. Pray for us, O holy mother of God. R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ. *Let us pray.* Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we thy servants may enjoy

perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joys, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Though the latter part of the above professes to be a prayer to God, and though Mary stands only as an intercessor, the first part is a direct prayer to Mary herself; and she is solicited to grant such things as God alone can grant. It is He alone that can hear the prayer of the miserable and afflicted throughout the world, and grant succour and comfort. The following is from the same "Garden of the Soul."

"HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

"Ave Maris Stella.

"Hail thou resplendent star,
Which shinest o'er the main;
Blest mother of our God,
And ever virgin queen.
"Hail happy gate of bliss,
Greeted by Gabriel's tongue;
Negociate our peace,
And cancel Eva's wrong.
"Loosen the sinners' bands;
All evils drive away:
Bring light unto the blind,
And for all graces pray.

"Exert the mother's care,
And us thy children own;
To him convey our prayer,
Who chose to be thy Son.
"O pure, O spotless maid,
Whose meekness all excell'd,
O make us chaste and mild,
And all our passions quell.
"Preserve our lives unstained,
And guard us in our way;
Until we come to thee,
To joys that ne'er decay.

"Praise to the Father be,
With Christ his only Son,
And to the Holy Ghost,
Thrice blessed three in one. Amen."

Here the Virgin Mary is plainly invoked as the Saviour of sinners. To "negociate our peace, and cancel Eva's wrong," is nothing less than to make reconciliation with God, and do away the effects of the fall of our first parents. She is also intreated to do the work of the Holy Ghost; that is, to loose the bands of sinners, and give light to the blind. She is presumed able to quell all the corrupt passions of the human heart, and to impart mildness and purity. Every Christian knows that this is the work of God alone; but the poor deluded Romanists ask it of a fellow creature. The priests cause the people to err, and they who are led by them are destroyed.

I have before me another manual of devotion, which seems to be still more modern than Dr. Challoner's "Garden of the Soul." It is entitled, "A Manual of devout prayers and other Christian devotions: fitted for all persons and occasions, and corrected from the errors of former editions. To which are added, Vespers for Sundays and Complin." Printed in Preston, 1785.—This work is evidently intended for Papists in England, for it fixes the times of plenary indulgences in the London and the three other districts. I extract from it the following:—

"A Prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

"O blessed Virgin *Mary*, immaculate mother of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, recommend, we beseech thee, these our imperfect prayers to the mercy of thy glorious Son, and offer him thy own most acceptable intercession for us; that he would be pleased to pardon our sins past, and deliver us from future temptations, and protect us in all our ways, with the assistance of his grace.

"O blessed Virgin, by that unspeakable gladness, which filled and overflowed thy spirit, when the angel declared to thee the adorable mystery of our Saviour's incarnation, and by that perfect resignation of thyself to the will of God, when thou humbly answeredst, *Behold the handmaid of our Lord, let it be done unto me according to thy word*, we beseech thee obtain for us the graces of a lively faith, a discreet humility, and a cheerful submission to the divine will in all things.

"O admirable mother, by the tender love, and continual service of the blessed Jesus, in his infancy, and by that incomparable happiness thou afterwards enjoyedst in his heavenly doctrine and miraculous life, we beseech thee to obtain for us a diligent devotion, and a constant perseverance in our duty to God, that our delight may be in his law, and our confidence in his holy protection.

"O mother of pity and compassion, by those sharp sorrows which pierced thy heart, when thou wast a sad witness of thy Son's sufferings, and beheldest him in that bitter agony, all torn with cruel scourges, and bleeding on the cross, forsaken of his friends, and dying in the midst of his enemies, we beseech thee to obtain for us compassion towards the affliction of others, and patience in our own, and also a faithful correspondence to the great love of our Redeemer.

"O glorious Virgin, by those excessive joys wherewith thy soul wholly ravished at the victorious resurrection of thy Son, and his triumphant ascension above the highest heavens, we beseech thee to obtain for us the blessings of a virtuous life, and holy death, and a happy resurrection, that we may ever rejoice in the presence of God, and admire his glory, and praise his goodness, through the same Jesus Christ; who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end."

The following is given, both in this work, in the "*Garden of the Soul*," and in most of the books of devotion that I have seen in Latin, French, and English:

"The short Litany of the Blessed Virgin.

Lord, have mercy on us.

Christ, have mercy on us.

Lord, have mercy on us.

Jesus, receive our prayers.

Lord Jesus, grant our petitions.

O God the Father, Creator of the world, have mercy on us.

O God the Son, Redeemer of mankind, have mercy on us.

O God the Holy Ghost, Perfecter of the elect, have mercy on us.

O holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us.

Holy <i>Mary</i> , <i>pray for us.</i>	Mirror of modesty, silence, and re-
Holy Mother of God,	tirement,
Holy Virgin of Virgins,	Mirror of wisdom, devotion, and
Daughter of the eternal Father,	sanctity,
Mother of the eternal Son,	Mirror of faith, hope, and charity,
Spouse of the eternal Spirit,	Mirror of all virtues,
Tabernacle of the glorious Trinity,	Refuge of sinners,
Mother of Jesus,	Comfort of the afflicted,
Mother of the Messiahs,	Advocate of all Christians,
Mother of the desired of all nations,	Queen of angels,
Mother of the Prince of Peace,	Queen of patriarchs and prophets,
Mother of the King of heaven,	Queen of apostles and martyrs,
Mother of our Creator,	Queen of confessors and virgins,
Mother and Virgin,	Queen of saints, <i>pray for us.</i>
Virgin most chaste and spotless,	Lamb of God, that takest away the
Virgin most mild and merciful,	sins of the world, <i>spare us, O</i>
Virgin most prudent and faithful,	<i>Lord.</i>
Virgin most miraculously fruitful,	Lamb of God, that takest away the
Ever-Virgin,	sins of the world, <i>Hear us, O</i>
Root of the Tree of Life,	<i>Lord.</i>
Source of the Fountain of Grace,	Lamb of God, that takest away the
Orient of the Son of glory,	sins of the world, <i>have mercy on us.</i>
Blessed among women,	Lord, have mercy on us.
Blessed among the children of men,	<i>Christ have mercy on us.</i>
Blessed throughout all generations,	Lord, have mercy on us.
Mirror of humility and obedience,	Our Father, &c.
Mirror of patience and resignation,	

The Antiphon.

Wonderful art thou, O God, in all thy saints, but incomparably more in the mother of thy Son; who remaining a virgin, brought forth the Saviour of the world; and living humbly on this our low earth, is now exalted above the highest seraphims.

Vers. Rejoice, O my soul, in the glory of the blessed virgin mother.
Allelujah.

Resp. By the fruit of whose womb we are regenerated to eternal life.
Allelujah.

Vers. O Lord, hear my prayer.

Resp. And let my supplication come unto thee."

I dare say most of my Protestant readers would imagine that I was writing of the dark ages, or of Popish worship in the heart of Spain or Italy, if I had not told them that the above is extracted from books of devotion used in England at this very day. I have a great deal worse to exhibit for the dark ages. I can produce prayers in which Mary is actually exalted above Jesus Christ, and in which she is intreated to *command* her Son to grant what the worshipper desires of him; nay, in which she is represented as saving those whom Christ would reject; and I can show that, with regard to the moral character of those on whom she bestowed her favours, she was not more nice than the ancient Venus was with regard to the character of her worshippers.

THE

Protestant,

No. XLI.

SATURDAY, APRIL 24th, 1819.

IN my last Number, I convicted modern Papists of idolatry, upon the authority of their own organ and vindicator. Mr. Andrews cannot say that I rest my accusation upon the authority of authors disapproved and condemned by the Church of Rome; for he has not been honoured by such condemnation. He stands as the approved advocate of Popery in Britain; he is supported and recommended by Dr. Milner, a Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic; and, under this high authority, he teaches all the youth of the Romish communion in England to worship the Virgin Mary, as the medium by which they will receive all blessings in life, and at death. I request my readers to reflect on this subject; let them carefully peruse the chapter "on devotion to the Blessed Virgin," which I gave in my last Number, and say whether it be possible that such doctrine could proceed from a Christian, or from any man but a downright idolater?

To convict an individual Papist of idolatry would be comparatively a small matter,—to find a poor ignorant devotee of the Virgin Mary bowing down and worshipping before her image, would excite, perhaps, no more than a feeling of compassion for the deluded votary of the idol, and an effort to remove the delusion, by telling him of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but, when we find such idolatrous principles taught under Episcopal authority,—when we read a certificate, under the hand of an English Vicar Apostolic, that the book which contains them is "the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public;" that, "as such," he "shall not fail to recommend it in those places of education over which" he has "any authority or influence;"—we are led not only to contemplate the Popish part of our population as idolaters, in the grossest sense of the word, but to compassionate the state of their helpless offspring, for whom an idolatrous education is thus systematically provided; as if Satan, aware of the efforts which Christians are making for the subversion of his kingdom, were endeavouring to provide an army for his defence, by engaging all the youth of the Romish communion to devote themselves to an idol, which

he knows well is the same thing as devotion to himself. No matter though that idol be the mother of Jesus according to the flesh,—to worship her is no better than to worship the devil; for to worship any creature whatever is to obey the devil, who was the inventor, and who is the patron of creature worship. If Mr. Andrews shall be pleased to controvert this sentiment, and to defend his doctrine “of devotion to the Blessed Virgin,” I will give him all the advantage of laying it down broadly and plainly, as a doctrine held by THE PROTESTANT, that to worship, in a religious sense, the highest creature that God ever made, is no better than to worship the devil.

Here let me remark, in passing, that I consider as grossly blasphemous the title of “Mother of God,” which is usually given to the Virgin Mary, in all Popish books of devotion. In the New Testament, she is called the mother of Jesus, but this relates only to his human nature; and the expression cannot without impiety be used in relation to him as God.

I proceed now to give some specimens of the style in which this idol was addressed, and the estimation in which she was held by her worshippers in former times. There is a great deal of matter more gross than any thing which we find in Mr. Andrews’ school book, or “the Garden of the Soul;” but if it be at all admitted, that a creature, such as Mary, is a proper object of religious worship, it is of little consequence how extravagant the language of such worship may be. Nay, as we can never speak too highly of the true and proper object of worship, if this were Mary, the more highly her worshippers praised her the better.

“In the contemplations of the life and glory of Holy Mary, the Mother of Jesus, published anno 1685, *Permissu Superiorum*, it is said, ‘the Blessed Virgin is the empress of seraphims,—the most exact original of practical perfection which the omnipotence of God ever drew; and, by innumerable titles, she claims the utmost duty of every Christian, as a proper homage to her greatness.’” *McCulloch Pop. cond. p. 334.*

“O Mother of God,” says St. Germain, “your defence is immortal; your intercession is life; your protection is security; if you do not teach us the way, none can become spiritual, nor adore God in spirit. O most holy Virgin, none can have the knowledge of God, but by you: O Mother of God, none can be saved, but by you: O Virgin Mother, none can be delivered from dangers, but by you: O favoured of God, none can obtain any gift or grace, but by you.” *Verit. Devot. de Crasset. p. 31. quoted by McCulloch, p. 335.*

“From the time,” says St. Bernardine, “that the Virgin Mother conceived in her womb the word of God, she obtained, as I may say, a certain jurisdiction and authority over all the temporal processions of the Holy Ghost: so that no creature has received any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of his Holy Mother.” *Crasset. p. 37. Ibid.*

“ Approach,” says the Abbot of Celles, “ with a devout contemplation of spirit, toward the Blessed Virgin; because through her, and with her, and in her, and from her, the world both has, and will have, all that is good.—She is our advocate with the Son, as the Son is with the Father. She solicits for us, both the Father and the Son. Often those whom the *justice of the Son might condemn, the mercy of the mother delivers*. In short, as our Saviour once said that none could come to him while he was on earth, unless the Father drew him, so dare I, in some sort affirm *that none comes now to thy glorified Son, unless thou draw him by thy holy assistance.*” *Ibid.* pp. 33, 34. *Ibid.* 336.

Archbishop Usher, in his answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland, 4to. page 479, furnishes me with the following quotations from Popish authors, with whose works he seems to have been very familiar. He gives the Latin original in the margin, but I shall content myself with the English:—“ That because she is the mother of the Son of God who doth produce the Holy Ghost, therefore all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth. *Bernardine, Senens. Serm. 61. Artic. 1. cap. 8.* That she hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity, as herself doth testify, Prov. viii. 23. ‘I was ordained from everlasting,’ namely, a dispenser of celestial graces; and that in this respect, Cantic. vii. 4. It is said of her, ‘thy neck is a tower of ivory;’ because that as by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head to the body: so by the Virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ the head into his mystical body: the fulness of grace being in him, as in the head from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck through which it is transfused unto us: so that take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop as it were the sinner’s breath, that he is not able to live any longer.” *Bernardine, &c. Artic. 3. cap. 3.* and other authorities cited.

The Archbishop continues:—“ Then men stuck not to teach, that unto her all power was given in heaven and in earth. So that for heaven, when our Saviour ascended thither, this might be assigned for one reason (among others) why he left his mother behind him; lest, perhaps, the court of heaven might have been in doubt whom they should rather go to meet, their lord or their lady: and for earth, she may rightly apply unto herself that in the first of Ezra, ‘all the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord given unto me.’ And we may say unto her again, that in Tobit 13th, ‘thy kingdom endureth for all ages:’ and in the 144th or 145th Psalm, ‘thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages.’ That howsoever she was the noblest person that was, or ever should be in the world, and of so great perfection, that, although she had not been the Mother of God, she ought nevertheless

to have been the lady of the world."—Again : "Whence Luke ii. 51. it is written of the Virgin and glorious Joseph, he 'was subject unto them' that as this proposition is true,—all things are subject to God's command, even the Virgin herself; so this again is true also,—all things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God himself: that considering the Blessed Virgin is the mother of God, and God is her son, and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject unto her, and the mother hath pre-eminence and is superior to her son; it therefore followeth that the Blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God himself is subject unto her, in respect of the manhood which he assumed from her: that howsoever she be subject unto God, in as much as she is his creature, yet is she said to be superior, and preferred before him, in as much as she is his mother." Usher gives in the margin, pp. 480-482, the very words of the authors who speak such blasphemies, and refers to the particular discourses from which he quotes.

I am heartily sick of such abominable stuff; but justice to my subject requires me to go on. Some of my readers will have heard of the famous Psalter of Bonaventure, of which the design was to apply to the Virgin, all the addresses made to God in the psalms and hymns of the Church. This book was printed with license and commendation, as a piece 'which was profitable to be printed, and very piously and commendably to be recited by all men in their private prayers, to the honour of the Blessed Virgin.' The author of it, also, has been canonized by the church, and worshipped among others of the same fraternity; which certainly implies that his works were tolerably meritorious. A few quotations will discover what exercises are permitted in the Romish Church. "Come unto Mary, all ye that labour and are heavy laden; and she shall refresh your souls. Come unto her in your temptations; and the serenity of her countenance shall establish you. O lady, in thee do I put my trust; deliver my soul from mine enemies. O give thanks unto the Lord for he is good. O give thanks unto his Mother, for her mercy endureth for ever." *McCulloch, Pop. Cond. pp. 337, 338.*

Usher gives several quarto pages of extracts from this Popish version of the Psalms, in the original Latin, with a translation. Here the Virgin Mary is the Alpha and the Omega. The most sublime ascriptions of praise to the Creator and Preserver of all things, are addressed to Mary, under the title of "our Lady." The last psalm is made to begin with "Praise our Lady in her saints; praise her in her virtues and miracles;" and it concludes thus, "*Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram*;"—let every spirit (or every thing that has breath) praise our Lady." *Usher's Ans. &c. p. 493.*

Connected with this, the Archbishop gives us the words of Bernardinus de Busti, which exceed even Bonaventure in blas-

phemy:—"But thou, O most grateful Virgin, didst not thou something to God? Didst not thou make him any recompense? Truly (if it be lawful to speak it) thou in some respect did greater things to God, than God himself did to thee and to all mankind. I will therefore speak that, which thou out of thy humility hast past in silence. For thou only didst sing, 'He that is mighty hath done to me great things:' but I do sing and say that thou hast done greater things to him that is mighty." *Ibid* p. 494.

To show that Mary is exalted above Jesus Christ; and to give her greater interest in the affections of her deluded worshippers, the same Bernardine relates a vision, which he says was shown to St. Francis, or (as some would have it) to his companion Friar Leon. He saw "two ladders that reached from earth to heaven; the one red upon which Christ leaned, from which many fell back and could not ascend: the other white upon which the holy Virgin leaned, the help whereof such as used, were by her received with a cheerful countenance, and so with felicity ascended into heaven." *Ibid* p. 495. "More present relief," says St. Anselm, and after him other authors; "More present relief is sometimes found, by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, her only Son." Which one of your Jesuits is so far from being ashamed to defend, that he dareth to extend it farther to the mediation of other saints also, telling us very peremptorily, that as our Lord Jesus worketh greater miracles by his saints, than by himself, (John xiv. 12.) so often he sheweth the force of their intercession more than of his own. *Ibid* p. 495. The author refers on the margin to Henry Fitzsimon, of the Mass, lib. 2. part 2. cap. 3.

"If Popish tales be true," says M'Culloch, page 338, "the Romish Church is under very strong obligations to pay all this homage, and a great deal more to the Virgin. There is scarcely any favour which she has withheld from her devout worshippers. She has delivered them from sickness, restored their eye-sight, preserved them from dangers, saved them from the gallows, and even raised them from the dead; and, what must peculiarly tend to the consolation of Papists, she is not at all squeamish as to the choice of her votaries. 'Sinners,' says Crasset, 'being her subjects, make up her crown and glory; and it is for that she loves them with the tenderness and sweet compassion of a mother, let them be ever so wicked.' 'Know thou,' said the Virgin herself to St. Bridget, 'my dearest child, that there is no man in the world so lewd and accursed of God, that he is entirely forsaken of him while he lives; no sinner so desperate, but he may return and find mercy with him, *provided he have recourse to me.*' *Brig. Revela. lib. 6. cap. 10.*"

Crasset has given many proofs of her extensive benevolence to the chief of sinners; but this benevolence is not exercised in the

way of saving them from their sins, but merely from the punishment which they deserve; or in preserving them during a life of sin, so that they shall not die without an opportunity of making confession at their last moments, which is understood to make all right. See an illustration of this at the conclusion of my third Number; and, in addition, take the following:—

“ A certain young Gascon soldier, having spent his fortune, afterwards, for particular reasons, sold himself to the devil, and renounced the Saviour. No temptation, however, could induce him to sacrifice his interest in the Virgin; and this confidence in her mercy secured him protection from his old acquaintance, Satan, who began to be troublesome, notwithstanding their former friendship. On prostrating himself before an image of the Virgin with Christ in her arms, he was greatly comforted by the following dialogue between the two idols:—‘ O my sweet son, have mercy on this man.’ ‘ Why, mother, what would you have me to do with this wretch who has renounced me?’ The Virgin on this prostrated herself before her son, and again demanded his pardon. This was irresistible. The little image raised the large one from the ground, and replied, ‘ I never yet refused my mother any thing that she asked: I grant it, for your sake, and for yours alone.’ *Crasset, page 90, quoted by M. Culloch, page 340.* Should any incredulous reader inquire how the images could hold such a conversation, or how a little image in the arms of a large one could raise it from the ground, and embrace it, let him recollect that this is the least marvellous part of the adventure.”

Palbert of Tameswaer relates the following extraordinary instance of the power of the Virgin:—“ A certain wicked villain fell into the Danube, and remained under water for three days. In ordinary cases, there certainly would have been some danger of drowning; but, to the rogue’s great surprise, he was greeted in this new element with the following address, ‘ Thou well deservest, base rascal, to lose thy life, and be condemned for ever, for thy sins; but because thou art a servant of the Virgin Mary, thou shalt be delivered from this danger, that thou mayest go and be confessed.’ Up he came accordingly, and made the above declaration to the priest Palbert himself. *Crasset (p. 130.)* refers to this story of Palbert, and informs us that the works of this priest were dedicated to the Pope, from which we may infer, if we please, that the story is worthy of all credit.” See *M. Culloch, p. 341.*

Idolatrous worship was usually accompanied by scenes of lewdness, and every species of wickedness; and the Church of Rome, following the footsteps of their heathen ancestors, have made an idol that without scruple indulges those who worship her, in such practices as were reckoned most acceptable to the idol of Paphos. In short, the Virgin Mary is represented as little better than a pander of lewdness. I have been obliged to

read several stories of her, that would not be believed, if related of any virtuous woman. She has appeared to many grave monks and fathers, and caressed them just as a mother would do her infant child. It is related of several nuns who were warmly devoted to her service, that when they happened to have what in Scotland is called a misfortune, the Virgin has miraculously conveyed them out of the way, and assumed the exact appearance of their persons, till it was convenient for them to return to their places; and not one of the sisterhood knew that they had been absent. It is said that a certain Abbess, who happened to have a misfortune, had her place supplied by the Virgin, and the duties of her office performed so punctually, that though she was absent for a long time, none of the sisterhood so much as suspected the fact, or that they had the holy Virgin presiding among them, instead of their own spiritual mother. I do not choose to enlarge on this subject. Let the following story suffice as a specimen of the manner in which the Virgin Mary is represented as favouring the most vicious persons, if they be only devoted to her:—

“ We read, in Martial le Grand, of a woman very much given to lascivious and impure practices; but, amidst all her imperfections, she had such a great love and affection for the Virgin, that she never let a day pass without making her seven devout obeysances, accompanied with an *Ave Maria*. Yet that woman was a common and mercenary prostitute, particularly to one of chief note in the place, who had a spouse very devout and virtuous, who, impatient of such an affront, every day prayed the Virgin to avenge her of that strumpet. One day falling down before her image, she said to her, O my dearest lady, mirror of all purity, how can you suffer that harlot to insult me,—to rob me of my honour:—punish, punish her, I pray you, and take such exemplary vengeance as may deter all from like practices.—But the image, (O strange power of a prayer rightly made), the image, animated by miracle, answered her, My well beloved, it is not possible for me to satisfy your desire, not as if I knew not very well the justice of your complaint, and of the resentment of the outrage which that hussey does you: but the *honour and respect which she still bears to me*, amidst all her disorders, tie up my hands, and forbid the chastisement which you desire. But that you may not be altogether unsuccessful in your suit, I shall try, for your comfort, to obtain of my Son for her a perfect compunction of heart, and an entire retreat from such a detestable life; which she accordingly did.” *Free Thoughts*, p. 99.

From these things it appears that men and women may live in the habitual practice of all manner of wickedness, and yet their devotion will be extremely acceptable to the Virgin Mary. Let them be as wicked as it is possible for them to be, if they will but pay due respect to this idol,—if they will make so many obeysances to her, and say so many Aves every day, she will take

care that they shall not perish in their sins, or die without confession. It is impossible that any species of heathenism can have a worse effect upon the moral character of the people than this? Popery is corruption and abomination all over. It is the very dregs of the filth of the idolatry of ancient nations,—so much the more loathsome, that it professes to be of divine origin, and to be the religion of Him who was holy, harmless, undefiled; and who came to save his people from their sins; and to create them anew after his own image, in righteousness and true holiness.

I have given some stories relating to the Virgin Mary, as they are related by grave authors and saints of the Romish Church. It is needless to say that I do not believe one of them to be true. I take them all to be mere fables; but they are fables which were invented for the purpose of deceiving the people, and keeping them in bondage to an idol. They must have been very generally believed at the time they were published; I suppose they are believed in Popish countries to this day; and it is from the subjects of popular belief that we estimate the intellectual state of the people in any country. How deplorable, therefore, must be the condition of the people in every country where Popery is predominant; and how much to be dreaded its influence among ourselves. The Virgin Mary is held up as an object of worship, in all the schools in Britain, over which Bishop Milner has any authority or influence. A story is recorded of her attention to a dying soldier, in recompense of the sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life,—a story as absurd as any of those which I have given in this Number, from the writings of Papists in darker ages; but which Mr. Andrews gives as a solemn truth, for which see his own words in my last Number; and it is given evidently with the design of filling the minds of children in Popish schools with such a high notion of the power of the Virgin Mary, as that they may make her an object of worship and confidence; and by this means to train them up to all the idolatry, and of course, to all the superstition, vice, and wretchedness, of the dark ages.

At the conclusion of my thirty-first Number, I quoted a sentence or two from Mr. Andrews' chapter "on devotion to the Blessed Virgin." In language pretty plain, I represented him as teaching idolatry; or, which is the same thing, making religion to consist in devotion to the Virgin Mary. He has alluded to this part of my work once or twice, but he has made no reply. He has not so much as attempted to vindicate himself and his brethren from the accusation, that they consider *religion to consist in devotion to a creature*. This, therefore, may be held as admitted. Papists are proved to be idolaters, from their own writings; and THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR tacitly admits it. I intend to make a particular use of this admission in the beginning of my next Number

THE

Protestant,

No. XLII.

SATURDAY, MAY 1st, 1819.

THE SPECTATOR has compared the writer of a periodical paper to the runner of a stage coach, who must send it off at the time appointed, if he should run it empty. It must always be an unpleasant thing to run a coach without passengers; but the mortification arising from this will be sometimes equalled by the regret that the capacity of his vehicle is so limited, when more persons apply than can be accommodated.

A circumstance resembling the latter often excites the regret of THE PROTESTANT. He finds it difficult to condense just as much matter as will make a complete whole within itself, and, at the same time, fill eight pages of letter-press, and no more. He has often the mortification to have part of his manuscript returned along with the proof-sheet, because it cannot be comprised within the allotted space; and this extra matter is frequently condemned as useless, because what may be suitable to conclude one Number, may not be suitable to begin its successor.

I am led into these reflections by the conclusion of my last Number, which was a little abrupt. I convicted Mr. Andrews of tacitly admitting that Papists were idolaters, because he passed over my accusation to that effect without any reply. I had written some paragraphs to show that this inference was made according to his own mode of arguing; but I had not room for them in my last sheet; and, therefore, though contrary to my usual practice, I begin the present Number with what was intended for the conclusion of my last. I said "Papists are proved to be idolaters from their own writings, and THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR tacitly admits it."

He cannot reasonably object to this mode of drawing an inference from silence. He has repeatedly accused me of forgery; and, because I have not replied to the accusation, he holds me convicted. This would have been fair enough, had I been writing in my own defence, or answering his numerous accusations. He has affected to find me guilty of innumerable contradictions; and he might as well maintain that I admit all these,

because I have made no reply. But the fact is, I do not admit one of them. He has not detected one *real* contradiction in all that I have written; though, by misconstruction and misrepresentation, he has made out many *apparent* ones. This I intend to point out in due time. But I have more important work in hand, than replying to his accusations. He labours to make my character appear as black as possible; expecting, no doubt, that, by this means, he will make his church appear pure and white as snow. I read his bitterest reproaches and accusations without emotion, being perfectly conscious that not one of them applies to me: and as for the charge of forgery, which he has repeated so often, and about which he makes such a hue and cry, I am in no haste to reply to it; though I am ready to prove by credible witnesses, that the story (that is, of the man who left his wife, because she would not become Papist) is true as I gave it, in every material point. Mr. Andrews' correspondents here know it to be true in substance; and, I doubt not, they know also what means have been used to persuade the widow to destroy the letter which she found upon the person, or in the clothes of her deceased husband. This letter is extant, and is verbatim as I gave it in my twenty-fifth Number. Mr. Scott is reported (though I cannot vouch for the fact) to have declared it from the pulpit to be a forgery. If so, it must have been the work of one of his own people, who had smuggled it into the pocket of the dying man; for it was among Papists that he was taken ill, and Papists were about him during his illness. In short, if any of my readers, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement. In fact I did not relate the tenth part of the cruelty of the man to his wife, solely because she would not become Papist; nor the means which were used, both foul and fair, to persuade her to renounce her heresy.

Mr. Andrews writes as if the whole merits of the question between Protestants and Papists depended upon the truth or falsehood of this story. The thing in itself is of no consequence at all to the general argument; but by reiterating his charge of forgery, he hopes to divert me from exposing the vital errors of his system, and to engage me in a personal controversy. But I will not be so diverted. He may accuse me of all the crimes that were ever heard of in Newgate; but I can assure him this will not establish the credit of his church, or make her holy and infallible, or set aside the proofs of her idolatry which I have given, and which I intend to give farther in my future Numbers.

I have not yet professed to enter upon my own defence, or to make a formal reply to any part of *THE VINDICATOR*. It is quite unfair, therefore, to infer from my silence that I admit the truth of any thing that he has written. But he has avowedly engaged

to defend his church against my accusations. He promised to follow me through them all; and to refute them all. It is quite fair, therefore, to infer that he admits what he has passed over in silence. His church is convicted of all those things which I laid to her charge, to which he has made no reply. This embraces almost every thing contained between the third and eighteenth Numbers of the Protestant. For instance, I denied that Peter was ever Bishop of Rome. I defied the whole church to prove that Peter was ever in that city. To this he makes no reply. Upon the principle, therefore, of inferring conviction from silence, the Church of Rome is convicted of imposition, in giving herself out as the See of Peter; the Popes are convicted of imposition in giving themselves out as his successors; and the whole fabric of the Romish hierarchy, not having a stone to stand upon, must fall to the ground.

In my thirty-sixth Number, I accused Papists of being more stupid than the beasts of the field, for believing in transubstantiation. Mr. Andrews alludes to this with much feeling of indignation; but he makes no reply to the charge. Upon his principle of inferring conviction from silence, Papists are convicted of such stupidity. Mr. Andrews need not feel so indignant at the comparison I made, and which was suggested by himself, in his reference to Luther. The comparison is by no means new. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." Isa. i. 3. It was a very great degree of stupidity, which led the inspired Prophet to make such a comparison; but not greater than the stupidity of Papists, in believing a piece of bread to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Until Mr. Andrews answers this, and all the other matters contained in my work which he has passed over, I shall, agreeably to his own principles, hold him convicted of maintaining the errors which I have laid to the charge of his *infallible* church.

I now come to the proper subject of the present Number.

I have reason to think that I am now heartily abhorred by all good Papists, for the disrespectful manner in which they must suppose I have spoken of their great idol, the Virgin Mary. I assure them, however, that I do not regard *her* with disrespect. It was only the idol and the image to which Papists have given the name that called forth the strictures contained in my last Number. I believe Baal, the most ancient of idols, was an image of the sun. When the prophet Elijah mocked both the god and his priests, it is not to be supposed that he spoke disrespectfully of the bright luminary which enlightens the world. Neither must I be understood to detract from the honour of the mother of Jesus, when I expose the folly and impiety of giving to her that worship and honour which is due to God alone. I am persuaded that were she on earth, she would be the first to

condemn the idolatrous addresses to her, of which I gave specimens in my two last Numbers. She would disclaim, with abhorrence, the lowest degree of religious worship; how much more those blasphemous adorations in which she is exalted as equal, and even superior, to the Saviour of the world?

It cannot be denied there was a very early indication of undue respect for the mother of Jesus, which was instantly checked and reproved by Jesus himself. A certain woman, who had been listening to his heavenly discourse, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou hast sucked: But he said, yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Luke xi. 27, 28. It does not appear that the person who addressed Jesus had any acquaintance with Mary, or any undue respect for her personally; but being astonished by his manner of teaching, and by the divine dignity of all that he said and did, she expressed her feelings by exclaiming, what a blessed mother to have such a son! By his reply, he instructed all who heard him, and by the same he is instructing us, that to hear and obey the word of God, is greater blessedness than that which arises from the circumstance of being his mother. As a believer in Christ, Mary stood upon a footing of perfect equality with every other Christian; and every Christian, in virtue of his relation to Christ, is greater and more blessed than Mary was, considered merely as his mother. In the most emphatic manner Jesus refused to acknowledge any superiority on the part of his relations according to the flesh; nor would he suffer them to interfere in any part of his public ministry. On one occasion, when closely engaged in his work of teaching, "there came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he answered them saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? And he looked round about upon them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." Mark iii. 31—35.

Though it appears evident from the whole evangelical history that Christ never intended that Mary should be honoured above others of his followers: or that the circumstance of her being his mother according to the flesh, should ever be mentioned as the foundation of regarding her with any thing like divine honour, the Church of Rome has found means to exalt her above all the heavenly hosts, and to make her the principal object of the adoration of her devout members.

It is related that Mary herself appeared once to Thomas à Becket, and spoke as follows: (for the original, see Bernardin. de Bust. Marial. part. 10. Sermon. 2d. sect. ult. as quoted by Usher, p. 487.)—" ' Rejoice, and be glad, and be joyful with me,'

said the Virgin Mary, ‘ because my glory doth excell the dignity of all the saints, and all the blessed spirits; and I alone have greater glory than all the angels and saints together. Rejoice, because that as the sun doth enlighten the day and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world. Rejoice, because the whole host of heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoureth me. Rejoice, because my Son is always obedient to me, and my will and my prayers he always heareth. Or, as others do relate it, the will of the blessed Trinity, and mine is the same; and whatsoever doth please me, the whole Trinity with unspeakable favour doth give consent unto. Rejoice, because God doth always at my pleasure reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come. Rejoice, because I sit next to the holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified. Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys shall always stand, and never be finished or fail. And whosoever, by rejoicing with these spiritual joys, shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence; and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it in the sight of my Son, that it may possess joys with me.’ They tell us that many (*multæ meretrices*, for example, that would not sin on Saturday, for the reverence of the Virgin, whatsoever they did on the Lord’s day) seem to have the blessed Virgin in greater veneration than Christ her Son; moved thereunto out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the Son of God doth bear with the simplicity of those men and women; because he is not ignorant, that the honour of the mother doth redound to the child. Prov. xvii. 6. They argue farther, that if a Cardinal have this privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby: then, by an argument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the Blessed Virgin is able to deliver us from all evil: her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils, she would presently rescue him; and not permit that any one should have an evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown. They add, moreover, that for every of these crowns, a man shall obtain two hundred and seventy-three thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight days of indulgence: and that Pope Sixtus IV. granted an indulgence of twelve thousand years, for every time that a man in a state of grace should repeat this short orison or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted into her crown; ‘ Hail most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, the gate of paradise, the lady of the world. Thou art a singular and pure Virgin: thou didst bear Christ without sin; thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the

world, in whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil, and pray for my sins. Amen.'

"In the crown composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orisons that is prescribed to be said. 'O Empress and our most kind Lady, by the authority of a mother, command thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly things, unto heavenly desires: which is suitable unto that versicle which we read in the 35th Psalm of his Lady's Psalter:—'Incline the countenance of God upon us; and compel him to have mercy upon sinners;' the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus:—'Incline the countenance of thy Son upon us; compel him by thy prayers to have mercy upon sinners.' The Psalms of this Psalter do all of them begin as David's do; but with this main difference, that where the Prophet in the one aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the Friar in the other applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our Lady." *Usher's Answer*, see pp. 486—492, in which there are numerous quotations from this saint's Psalm book, by which all glory and power in heaven and earth are ascribed to the Virgin Mary.

When Papists are pushed hard upon this subject, they use many shifts and evasions. They are very much offended when we call them idolaters; and they will maintain broadly in the face of the sun, that when they pray to the Virgin Mary, they mean only to ask the benefit of her prayers, as one Christian friend asks the prayers of another; and that when they worship her, they intend only such a degree of civil respect as an inferior gives to a superior whom he addresses as right worshipful. They maintain "that there is no more danger of robbing God of his honour, by worshipping his angels and saints, than of robbing a king of his honour, by reverencing his peers and nobles, according to their several dignities and capacities." *Manual of Controversies clearly demonstrating the truth of the Catholic religion*, p. 285. They have accordingly different words, for expressing their different degrees of worship. *Latria*, they say, signifies divine worship which they give to God alone: *Dulia* signifies that inferior sort of worship which is due to angels and saints: and they have their *Hyperdulia*, which signifies that superior kind of inferior worship which is due to a creature so exalted as the Virgin Mary. But these distinctions are of no use to the great bulk of the people, who do not understand Greek; and who being incessantly urged to worship the saints, especially the Virgin Mary, fail not to give her the highest degree of devotion and worship of which they are capable. Besides, those who are acquainted with Greek know that the words *Latria* and *Dulia* are used indifferently to express divine worship; and that when the latter is used for civil respect, it is so connected with other

words as to fix its meaning without danger of leading to idolatry.

If it were true that Popish prayers to saints were no more than asking them to pray for us, as one Christian friend requests the prayers of another, it would require to be explained how persons in this world can communicate their requests to persons in the other world. Christians on earth can express their desires to one another by word or writing; and they do enjoy the benefit of one another's prayers. But how can a Papist make a saint in heaven acquainted with his necessities, or request his prayers? A glorified saint is but a finite creature. He cannot be in more than one place at one time, any more than a sinner on earth can be. How then can he attend to the prayers that are addressed to him from all parts of the world? Persons who excel in devotion to the Virgin Mary are represented as saying five *Ave Marias* for one *Paternoster*. Papists boast that there are six millions of their communion in Britain and Ireland: and supposing each to say his prayers only once a-day, the Virgin Mary would require to give daily attention to thirty millions of prayers coming from the British Islands alone, not to speak of the countless millions that must be sent up every day from Spain, Portugal, Italy, and all the other countries of the world, in which Popery has obtained a footing. Religion out of the question, common sense assures us that it is impossible for any creature to do what Mary is here supposed to do; and if Papists are desirous of having credit for common sense, they will never offer another prayer to a creature, or so much as say, "Holy Mary, pray for us."

But it is not true that their addresses to the Virgin Mary merely request the benefit of her prayers. Let any man read the language of their authorised books of devotion, of which I have given copious extracts in this and my two preceding Numbers, and let him say if it be possible to use language of more direct address, in the form of prayer, to the divine Being himself, than is addressed to the Virgin Mary. She is declared to be worthy of the "*utmost duty*" of every Christian, which is as much as can be said of what is due to God. Mr. Andrews himself holds her up as an object of *devotion*; and that he means it in a religious sense is evident from the blessings which, he says, this devotion will obtain. One of the most effectual means, "for acquiring virtue in youth," is, according to him, "devotion to the Blessed Virgin." Nay, Mr. Andrews says expressly, "the prayers we *offer her for our salvation* bring to us all that we desire;" and he quotes St. Bernard as saying, "That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effect of her assistance." See the whole chapter in my fortieth Number, pp. 314—316.

The most copious book of devotion that has come in my way, is intitled "*Heures, imprimées par l'ordre de Monseigneur le*

Cardinal De Noailles, Archevesque de Paris." I could fill many sheets with prayers to Mary and other saints from this book; but I shall satisfy myself at present with the following translation from pages 395, 396:—

"Give us access to thy Son, Mary, who hast found grace before the Lord, who art blessed among women, who hast brought life into the world and art the mother of salvation. Let him who hath been given us by thee, receive us by thee. Let thy purity excuse to him our corruption; let thy humility which hath been so agreeable to God, obtain pardon of our vanity; let the abundance of thy charity cover the multitude of our sins; and thy glorious fruitfulness shed on us a happy fruitfulness of merits and good works. Thou art our Queen, our Mediator, our Advocate. Reconcile us with thy Son; recommend us to thy Son; present us to thy Son," &c. See again: "We come to thee, fruitful mother, mother without spot; to whom God, the master of the universe, who dwelleth spiritually in the other saints, hath also dwelt in thee bodily," &c. &c.

Though the style of this prayer is not so gross as some others which I have given, the sentiment is equally abominable and idolatrous, Christ alone brought life and salvation into the world; but here this honour is ascribed to Mary. No man can obtain the pardon of sin but through the merits or righteousness of Christ; but the deluded votary of the Virgin Mary is taught by his church to ask this blessing for the sake of a mere creature. The purity, the humility, and the abundant charity of Mary, are supposed to be so meritorious as to make up for the want of these qualities in her devout worshippers. This is the great comprehensive sin of Popery. It is trusting in a creature, instead of trusting in the living God, and this, according to the word of God, brings down a curse instead of a blessing.

In short, Popish devotion consists, according to their approved liturgies, in little else than calling upon the Virgin Mary and other saints; that is, invoking and praying to mere creatures, which is downright idolatry. We are taught in the Scriptures, "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" and then it is asked, "how shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" Rom. x. 13, 14. From this it is evident that there can be no acceptable worship without faith in the object of worship. Those, therefore, who call upon the Virgin Mary, must believe in her; and unless they can show, from the word of God, some authority and warrant for believing in a mere creature, they must stand in the awful predicament of those who believe a lie, and who receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved.

THE

Protestant,

No. XLIII.

SATURDAY, MAY 8th, 1819.

NO part of the word of God is more plain and explicit than the command to abstain from the worship of creatures. The Almighty himself spoke these words from Mount Sinai, "I am the Lord thy God;—thou shalt have no other gods before me." And when the devil tempted Jesus Christ to commit idolatry by worshipping him, he replied, in allusion to the above, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve." When, through mistake, the Apostle John fell down before an angel to worship him, the heavenly messenger instantly rejected the proffered homage:—"See thou do it not;—I am thy fellow servant:—worship God." Rev. xix. 10. If the fact of being a fellow servant was an argument in the mouth of an angel, that he should not be worshipped; how much more forcible would it be in the mouth of those who are fellow creatures, as well as fellow servants? This is the condition of all the saints in heaven, who are mere fellow servants, and fellow creatures with the saints on earth; that is, with all Christians: for to apply the title of saint to some Christians and not to others, is a Popish error, and one that has been retained too long in some Protestant churches. The sinner who believed in Jesus Christ yesterday, for the first time, is as really a saint as Paul, or Peter, or even the Virgin Mary. He is "washed, and sanctified (that is, made a saint), and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;" 1 Cor. vi. 11. In times of primitive purity, the words Christian and saint were synonymous; and, to use the words of an acute writer, it was not till after the churches had begun to depart from the faith and practice of apostles and evangelists, that, to make amends, they knighted these servants of God, and called them saints, by way of eminence and distinction. I am aware that the passages of Scripture, to which I have here referred, will be of no weight with my Popish readers, because they do not submit to the authority of the Bible alone; but I am sure my Protestant readers will be convinced by such authority, that I do the Church of Rome no injustice, when I charge her with both idolatry and absurdity.

For what can be more absurd, than fellow creatures and fellow servants worshipping one another? What can be more impious, as well as absurd, than praying to fellow creatures, and requesting them to intercede and mediate with God for us, when we are assured by the word of God, that there is “*one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?*” What can be more impious than to call on the name of a mere creature to save us, when we are assured that besides Jesus Christ, there is no other name by which we can be saved? The Church of Rome is guilty of all this impiety, by teaching her deluded adherents to worship and call upon mere creatures.

I grant that those members of the Church of Rome, and of every other church, who are not Christians, are not saints. Let men call themselves by what name they please, if they are not subjects of that gracious and radical change, which is effected by the Holy Spirit upon all who are led by his divine influence to believe in Christ, and trust in him for the salvation of their own souls, they are not Christians. There is, therefore, an infinite distance between them and those who are properly called saints. They are sinners. This is their distinctive appellation. But as sinners, Christ makes them welcome to come to *himself*, directly and immediately, for the pardon of their sins, and the salvation of their souls. “Him that cometh to ME, I will in no wise cast out,” is the language of the gracious and almighty Saviour; but he never required or encouraged any sinner to go first to Mary, or to any of the saints.

It was false humility that led men first to think of approaching to God through the medium of mere creatures. They professed to believe him too great, and themselves too unworthy, to admit of direct intercourse. This would have been true, if he had not, of his infinite mercy, provided and revealed to us a medium of intercourse, and declared that his throne of mercy was accessible to any sinner of the human race who should come to him in the name of Christ. Having this revealed to us in the Scriptures, it is both our privilege and duty to come to him, in obedience to his invitation. He knows best what is suitable to his own glory, and to our circumstances; and as it is his glory to show mercy to the chief of sinners, they cannot honour him more than by coming to him as sinners, submitting to his righteousness, and accepting his overtures of mercy.

It is not humility, but pride, that prevents sinners from coming to God in the way which he has appointed. True humility would lead them to him in his revealed way; but pride will come only in its own way. Affecting to think themselves so very unworthy, and to believe God too great to regard them, Papists have devised a way of their own, by which alone they will come to Him, that is, through the medium of creatures, whom they call saints. For this they have not the shadow of a warrant from the word of

God; but being a way of their own devising, they adhere to it most pertinaciously: rather than not come to God in this way, they will not come at all; and as he never promised to accept any who came in this way, they can have no ground to hope that they will be accepted.

In my late Numbers, I have shown that the Virgin Mary is regarded by Papists as the principal medium of intercourse with God; but there are innumerable others whom they regard as objects of worship, to whom they address their prayers, and who are supposed to have such interest in the court of heaven, that they can obtain whatever their votaries ask of them. Thus the Church of Rome is proved to be the Antichrist that should arise in the latter days, that should "depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;" 1 Tim. iv. 1.

The words which our translators have rendered "doctrines of devils," are, in the original, διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, doctrines of demons, or concerning demons. Devil is the English word for δαίμων, not for δαίμων. The word here rendered devils, is the same that in Acts xvii. 18. is rendered *gods*. Οἱ δὲ Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεῖς εἶναι "Others said, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange *gods*; that is, because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." The Athenians supposed these to be two new deities whom Paul wished them to place among their other objects of worship. Our translators saw the impropriety of rendering the passage, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of *strange devils*," and they deviated accordingly from their usual way of rendering the word δαιμονίων. Suppose them to have translated 1 Tim. iv. 1. the same way, it would have been "doctrines of, or concerning *gods*," * that is, inferior deities, objects of religious

* I make these remarks without intending the least disrespect to the memory of our translators, or wishing to detract from the merit of their labours. They did not give themselves out as infallible. They took advantage of the degree of knowledge which they possessed, to improve upon their predecessors; and they left their successors at liberty to improve upon them. It is worthy of remark, however, that in those passages of the Bible which relate directly to the way of salvation,—that is, those which are of vital interest and importance,—the fidelity and correctness of our authorised version stand unimpeached. That they have, in some instances, mistaken the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word,—that they have translated δαιμονίων, *devils*, or any thing of a like nature, is comparatively of very little importance, seeing they have given us the gospel of salvation pure, and unadulterated by any inventions of their own.

"Mr. Andrews, in some of his late VINDICATORS," says an anonymous Correspondent, "musters up a long list of passages from Protestant translations of the Bible, and takes it for granted that they are, and must be, errors, *because* they differ from the same passages, as translated by Catholics. Good honest soul! it never occurred to him, I suppose, that this kind of proof would be quite thrown away upon us. A Catholic is the last person in the world, whose word we would take for what *is*, and for what is *not*, in the Bible. But it is needless to waste time in addressing THE VINDICATOR upon this topic. The two lists of passages which

worship, which are yet allowed to be mere creatures. This was the error of the heathen, who deified the spirits of departed heroes and lawgivers, and made them objects of idolatrous worship, though still considered to be inferior to the supreme deity.

In this respect, Popery is nothing else than the ancient heathenism under a new name. Their saints occupy the very place in their worship that demons, or inferior deities, did in that of ancient Rome; and as every country, and almost every city, had its own tutelar deity, so, in Popish countries, every city or province has its patron saint.

“The noblest heathen temple now remaining in the world, is the Pantheon, or Rotunda; which, as the inscription over the portico informs us, having been impiously dedicated of old by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods, was piously consecrated by Pope Boniface IV. to the Blessed Virgin and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of the Popish, as it did for the Pagan worship, for which it was built. For as, in the old temple, every one might find the god of his country, and address himself to that deity, whose religion he was most devoted to; so it is the same thing now: every one chooses the patron whom he likes best; and one may see here different services going on at the same time, at different altars,

he contrasts may all be mistranslations, for any thing he seems to know about the matter. But although we admit that the passages he has quoted from Protestant translations are all and every one of them errors, the admission will be of little service to the Popish cause. Still we say that a translation of a book like the Bible, in which all classes are vitally interested, although it have many faults, is better than *no translation*. We might say that a perfect or faultless translation of any one book is nowhere to be found: we do say that a perfect or faultless translation of the Bible, now is, and probably will continue to be, a *desideratum*. We have no right to expect such a translation, because we have no right to expect that the same blessed Spirit who dictated the originals will ever be imparted to any translator, or body of translators, so as to make them infallible. In plain language, Papists are hostile to all translations of the Scriptures, whether they be good, bad, or indifferent. They are offended with ours, not because we have missed the meaning in a few passages, but because we have found it in all but a few; not because we have thrown too little light upon the Bible, but because we have thrown too much light upon it. It is the Bible,—the Bible they are against, and not the errors of our translations of it; and for this very good reason, *the Bible is against them*. But it will be replied, as indeed it has been, ‘that Papists cannot be hostile to all translations of the Bible into modern languages, for they have made and published such translations themselves. Yes, indeed, they have; but such translations as literally tantalize the unlearned reader. He takes up one of them: he goes on a little way, and begins to feel interested; when lo! and behold! he comes to a passage, which, if properly translated, would expose some Popish dogma, or some Popish ceremony. To prevent the exposure, the prudent translator either retains one or more of the original words, or accompanies his translation of them by a note, which, to the insulted, abused reader wrests the whole passage, or envelops it in impenetrable mystery.’”

with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them, to the worship of this or that particular saint." *Middleton's Letter from Rome, 4th ed. p. 161.*

"And what better title can the new demigods show to the adoration now paid to them, than the old ones, whose shrines they have usurped? or how comes it to be less criminal to worship images erected by the Pope, than those which Agrippa or Nebuchadnezzar set up? If there be any real difference, most people, I dare say, will be apt to determine in favour of the old possessors: for those heroes of antiquity were raised up into gods, and received divine honours, for some signal benefits of which they had been the authors to mankind; or the invention of arts and sciences; or of something highly useful and necessary to life: whereas of the Romish saints, it is certain, that many of them were never heard of but in their own legends and fabulous histories; and many more, instead of any service done to mankind, owe all the honours now paid them, to their vices or their errors; whose merit, like that of Demetrius in the Acts, was their skill of raising rebellions in defence of an idol, and throwing kingdoms into convulsions, for the sake of some gainful imposture.

"And as it is in the Pantheon, it is just the same in all other heathen temples that still remain in Rome; they have only pulled down one idol to set up another, changing rather the name than the object of their worship. Thus the little temple of Vesta, near the Tiber, mentioned by Horace, is now possessed by the Madonna of the sun; that of Fortuna Virilis, by Mary the Egyptian; that of Saturn, where the public treasure was anciently kept, by St. Adrian; that of Romulus and Remus, in the *via sacra*, by two other brothers, Cosmus and Damianus; that of Antonine the godly, by Laurence the saint: but, for my part, I had sooner be tempted to prostrate myself before the statue of a Romulus or an Antonine, than that of a Laurence or a Damian: and give divine honours rather, with Pagan Rome, to the founders of empires, than, with Popish Rome, to the founders of monasteries." *Ibid. pp. 162—164.*

Having adverted to these things in general, I shall proceed to give a particular account of one of these demons, or inferior deities, which are worshipped by Papists in our own island, and which is firmly believed by them to work miracles at the present day: at least the most unanswerable and most orthodox Dr. Milner, Bishop of Castabala, and Vicar Apostolic, says so; and even certifies one of her miracles under his own hand. This is the tutelar deity of Wales; for, like the ancient heathens, Papists have their gods of the mountains, as well as their gods of the vallies. Her name is St. Wenefride; and my great opponent, THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, has lately published an account of her life and miracles with a recommendatory preface. The

thing in itself is not of much importance. The story is in general extremely ridiculous; but Mr. Andrews, who seems inclined to make his shop the receptacle of all the literary filth of the dark ages, has republished it, with a fine portrait of the *holy saint*. I give an abridgment of the story, not for the edification of my readers, but as a specimen of Popish literature, and of what will be generally read by our Masters and Misses, after Popery shall be re-established among us.

The work is entitled, "The life and miracles of St. Wenefride, Virgin, Martyr, and Abbess, Patroness of Wales. To which are added, the Litanies of the holy saint. Printed by W. E. Andrews, 1817." It has for a motto, "God is wonderful in his saints," Psalm lxvii. 36. The editor begins his preface, or address to the reader, as follows;—"The following *excellent* little volume, printed in the year 1712, was, as the preface informs us, translated from the life of St. Wenefride, written by Robert of Shrewsbury." "The work itself," he says, "is written in a style of such sweet and amiable simplicity, and possesses so much of that unction, which is best known by its effects upon the soul of the reader, but is incapable of being described, that the editor of the present edition has been careful to make no other alteration than the correction of a few inaccuracies of grammar, and some obsolete or quaint expressions. Many miraculous events are recorded in this volume, which the pious reader will know how to turn to proper advantage. The miracles of which we read in the lives of St. Wenefride, and other saints, are not to be rejected merely because they are miraculous, and out of the ordinary course of nature. Upon this ground, the holy Scriptures, which, as to the historical part of them, are one continued series of miracles, might be rejected as incredible, or as fabulous.

"To the miracles which happened at the translation of the relics of St. Wenefride, in the year 1138, Robert of Salop was an eye-witness. The great veneration of our ancestors for this saint, is a proof of her eminent sanctity, and past ages are unanimous in their testimony of the extraordinary favours granted to those who have *invoked her intercession*. Some of these are faithfully recorded in the latter part of this little volume; and the pious reader will find that, even in this our age, Almighty God still honours the memory of the glorious St. Wenefride, and verifies the truth of the address, which, in imitation of our pious ancestors, we make to her, in the litany of intercession for England, 'Holy St. Wenefride, even in this unbelieving generation, *still miraculous*, pray for us.'"

Thus Mr. Andrews holds up St. Wenefride, as well as the Virgin Mary, as a deity to be invoked; and I suppose she is, at this day, most devoutly worshipped by every good Papist in Wales. This is one of the idle drones of godly virgins, of whom, in my seventeenth Number, I promised to give some ac-

count; and an idle drone this saint must have been, even according to the account of her devoted admirers; for it does not appear from her history that she was of any real use to her own age; and her example could not profit the ages which followed, but must have been extremely pernicious, if it be true that such a person ever existed:—

“In the seventh age after man’s redemption, flourished many saints of both sexes. I shall only mention those chiefly concerned in this short history. St. Beuno, the glorious instrument of St. Wenefride’s second life and sanctity, was born of noble parents in Montgomery shire, at the fall of the river Rhyw into the Severn; therefore called Aberhyw. His father, Binsi, descended lineally from Caddel, prince of Glesiwig, and his mother derived her pedigree from Aïna, (who was married to the king of the Picts) sister to the mighty and renowned King Arthur, who departed happily this life, and was interred at Glastonbury, in the year 542. His grandfather was St. Gundeleyus, and he was nearly related to several eminent saints; amongst the rest he was cousin-german to St. Kentigern, bishop of Glasgow, who, forced from Scotland, founded the bishoprick of St. Asaph, from his disciple of that name, whom he left to govern that church.”

St. Wenefride’s Life, pp. 20, 21. It would appear that as far back as the sixth century, bishops and saints were no favourites in Scotland, seeing such a holy man as St. Kentigern was forced out of it. It is not said whether the Scots of that day, who were guilty of this outrage, were Pagans or Presbyterians; but as for the good citizens of Glasgow, they must have been very different from those of the present day, if they were guilty of any incivility to the holy saint, if he was willing to live and let live. But to proceed:—

“This zealous monk (St. Beuno) having finished his monastery at Clynoc Vaws, in Carnarvonshire, found himself powerfully inspired to visit his relations in Flintshire. It is true, he had longbefore bid adieu to all ties of flesh and blood; but he understood this call as a voice from heaven. A rich and potent lord, in that part of North Wales where now Holywell is, had married the virtuous and noble lady Wenlo, sister to St. Beuno. His name was Thewith, some write it Trebwith; but a manuscript now before me of one of the most learned antiquaries of the last age, says his name was Tyvid. These parents of St. Wenefride, by an exemplary and truly Christian life, surpassed their high extraction. They reckoned solid virtue as the most distinguishing quality, and they pitied vicious potentates, who are contemptible in the eyes of the King of kings. Saint Wenefride, the glory of West Britain, was born in the troublesome reign of King Cadwallawn; and St. Beuno made his visit to his brother-in-law’s house, in the reign of King Eluith, the second of that name. The venerable monk, having much humility and

great modesty, made himself known, told them that he was sent by Almighty God, to honour him there, as he had done in other places; and that he neither expected nor craved any other favour, than a small parcel of his large territories, sufficient to build a church on; where others, with myself, said he, will daily pray for your safety and happiness.

“Thewith (I shall stile him so for the future) was not in the miserable catalogue of those thoughtless, blind worldlings, who are prodigal in vanity and ostentation, but start and frown at the first proposal of parting with small matters for the advantage of their souls. No, he looked forward with other eyes, toward a more permanent being, than here upon sordid earth; therefore returned he the following answer:—‘With good reason, holy father, I am obliged to give you part of the lands I now possess, for His sake and service who bestowed them all on me. You have pleased me in asking this charity, which is more advantageous to me than to you who propose it. Therefore, from this very day, I do absolutely alienate from myself, and my posterity, this manor I now live in, and with joy I do surrender unto you all my right and title, and I put you into possession. I humbly beg a favour, that having one only child, a tender virgin, who is my special comfort, you will instruct her in heavenly documents, that her life and conversation may be holy, pleasing to God, and joyful to her parents.’ After this generous settlement, the nobleman made choice of a dwelling seat, not far distant from the place he had given to St. Beuno; where, on a hill, he could see the church, where the servants of God praised their Maker.

“As Constantine the Great, at the building of St. Peter’s Basilick, divested himself of his imperial robes, took up the spade, broke ground, and carried twelve baskets of earth, in honour of the twelve apostles, to cast into the foundation; in testimony of his devotion to the primitive princes of Christianity; so, in imitation of this heroic pattern, the noble lord, Thewith, set aside state and birth, many times putting his own hands to the holy work. This he did to encourage others, and to contribute in some sort to the finishing of the fabrick. The church being made fit to offer in it the divine sacrifice, he and his spouse, with their only child, were daily present at holy mass. They had this pious custom, to place their daughter at the saint’s feet, at the time of his exhortations to the people, advising her to give attention to his excellent doctrine. This was not necessary, although religiously suggested by pious parents; for she was so much transported with a holy delight in hearing him preach, that she frequently visited him alone, to discourse of self-knowledge, and Christian performances.” *Ibid*, pp. 22—26.

For want of room I must defer the miraculous part of the story, which will appear in my next Number.

THE

Protestant,

No. XLIV.

SATURDAY, MAY 15th, 1819.

I PROCEED in the present Number to give some farther account of St. Wenefride, whom I shall not describe as one who lived in a certain age of the world; but as one who lived in the world many years after her death.

“It was her parents’ intention to marry her to some nobleman of the country, and to bestow on her a most plentiful fortune; but her ever blessed Redeemer, in those tender years, was disposing her sweetly for his service. By saint Beuno’s frequent discourses, she understood, how great, how good, and how glorious, the Heavenly Spouse was; that voluntary virgins are like angels upon earth; that they follow the Lamb, wherever he goes. (Apoc. xiv.) That the honours of the world are vain, and its pleasures short lived; so that the very thought of an earthly husband became hateful unto her. Wherefore she resolved to keep herself undefiled, and to consecrate her pure virginity to the Lord of heaven and earth. One main difficulty occurred, how to render her parents favourable to this heavenly call. She burned with the love of God, and at the same time she resolved to fulfil the commandment of honouring father and mother. In this struggle betwixt divine vocation and Christian duty, the Bestower of all Lights put her into a method, how to prepare the way towards her happiness, by making use of St. Beuno, as a glorious instrument.

“This holy man was honoured as a saint by her parents, and by consequence she knew very well, that he had great power and authority with them, and they would not reject any reasonable request made by him, such as she took hers to be. Impatient of losing time, for completing her design, having found him one day alone, and at liberty, she acquainted him with the holy fruits of his moving discourses, and after a very pathetic manner, humbly petitioned for his zealous concurrence, in preserving the rich

treasure of her virginity, which she resolved never to part with, for all the offers the flattering world could make her. Saint Beuno was agreeably surprised at this most welcome news: for, as St. Paul, he desired all to be like unto himself. (1 Cor. xi. 1.) He had unshaken confidence in God's power and goodness, that he who had begun the work, would give it the finishing stroke. Moreover, being no stranger to the singular piety of those he was to treat with, he cheerfully undertook the task, to the unexpressible satisfaction of the expecting virgin.

"We cannot read without flowing tears, how faithful Abraham, in obedience to God's command, had his hand lifted up to sacrifice his son Isaac, his only begotten son, whom he loved: (Gen. xxii. 2.) not so much as demurring at the first intimation of the Omnipotent; perhaps it may move to devotion, by a serious consideration, how the lord Thewith entertained this unexpected petition of his dear child. Besides the internal gifts of grace, the apparent virtues, which charmed her devout parents, her stature was well proportioned, her face was matchless, her modesty equalled her beauty, qualifications much admired by mankind. She was the agreeable object of their eyes, the support of their family, and the prospect of their happiness upon earth. Yet no sooner had saint Beuno delivered his sentiments, as to the nature of the offering; that it was a sort of holocaust to sacrifice their affections, and to bequeath to their God the dearest creature in the world, whom they loved more than they did themselves: with other persuasive reasons to the same effect, the holy man, I say, had no sooner ended his discourse, than contrary to the weakness of other fond parents, tears of joy came trickling down lord Thewith's cheeks, who with his spouse, broke out into the praises of Jesus Christ, for so highly favouring their only child. They then called for their daughter, and gave her full and free leave to forsake the world, wishing her a happy progress in the way of perfection. They likewise declared, that the Heavenly Spouse having made choice of her, they intended to make him heir of what they designed for her dowry, by disposing of the same, to his great honour, in pious and religious uses. They drew also this advantage to themselves, of renouncing the world, so far as was consistent with persons in their station. They entered into a firm resolution of giving to the poor great part of their princely wealth, of retiring from worldly noise and hurry, that with an undepending freedom, they might be more absolute masters of short time, to provide, and send before them, never ending treasures to heaven.

"The pious virgin receiving this coveted grant, concluded that she could never return sufficient thanks to God for the favour. She watched whole nights in the church, either kneeling or prostrate before the altar, where she imagined to herself, that she was in her immortal Spouse's presence chamber. Contemplation raised her up into admiration of his infinite perfections; so that

to hear Jesus Christ only named, brought joyful tears into her eyes from a flaming heart. Pure delights overflowed her soul; and looking towards heaven, the world appeared base and contemptible. To add fuel to this pleasing fire she procured a little oratory near unto saint Beuno's cell, to visit him with greater ease in the day-time, and in silent night to practise her master's spiritual lessons."

The virtue of this holy virgin was, it seems, assaulted by a cruel Welch Prince named Cradocus, who found her at home, and alone, one day when the rest of the family were at church. My readers must excuse me from giving the particulars of the temptation with which she was assailed. I expect that Mr. Andrews will find me guilty of many bad things for not giving the very words of this part of the book which he recommends so warmly; but if the very words must be given, he is welcome to do it; and I had rather that they should appear in his pages than mine. Suffice it to say, that by means of something very like a lie, at least a false pretext, the *holy saint* escaped out of his hands, and made the best of her way to the church; but Cradocus overtaking her, with sword in hand, renewed his wicked proposal, and gave her the choice of submission or death. I give the sequel of this part of the history in the words of the author:—

"As it happens sometimes, that despised carnal love turns into rage, so it fared with barbarous Cradocus, who seeing himself scorned, (as he thought) gave such a deadly blow to the virgin's neck, that the first stroke severed the head from the body: which falling upon the descent of the hill, rolled down to the church, where the congregation were kneeling before the altar. As they were terrified with the bloody object of her head, so they were astonished, to behold a clear and rapid spring, gushing out of that spot of ground, her head had first fallen upon, which to this very day, is visited from all parts, by devout pilgrims.* The place of her martyrdom, had before her death, the name of the Dry Valley, or Barren Bottom, which was changed into the title of Finhon, which, in old Welch, signifies a fountain or well. 'Twas also observed, that the stones of the well, were tinctured with drops, as it were of blood, to perpetuate the memory of what she had shed for the love of Christ, and in process of time, it was taken notice of, that the moss growing round

* I suppose Mr. Andrews does not know that there is a similar story related of a French saint. Perhaps the one story is a mere echo of the other:—"A holy woman named, Reine, suffered martyrdom about Alise, a little village near Flavigny. When she was beheaded, at the very place where the head lighted on the ground, a spring bubbled up at that very instant, for a perpetual miracle, in witness of God's approbation of the confession of faith made by his handmaid." This spring is also remarkable for its healing qualities; and the monks of St. Francis have a chapel beside it, as St. Wenefride had for ages at her *holy well*. See *Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests*, vol. 1. p. 4.

the well, had a very fragrant smell, as an emblem of the odour of her angelical virtues.

“ To close the last act, of this inhuman tragedy, and to relate the dreadful stroke of divine justice, on the cruel tyrant, we are to premise with brevity; that the just grief of the holy virgin’s parents, is not to be expressed, seeing their dear child, so villainously butchered almost before their eyes. St. Beuno’s virtue was also put to the test, to bear with true resignation the loss of so devout a creature. Tears came trickling down his cheeks, at the sight of the horrid murder. The afflicted people with united voices, called upon Heaven for speedy execution against him, who had committed that heinous outrage. Indignation accompanied compassion, when they beheld the unrelenting assassin, wiping his bloody sword upon the grass, and glorying in the detestable fact, without any fear of God or man. Saint Beuno was preparing to offer the unbloody sacrifice of our redemption; but being inspired by him, who declared, revenge to me, and I will repay it: (Deut. xxxii. 35.) he left the altar, and taking the blessed martyr’s head in his trembling hands, he mounted the ascent towards Cradocus. He feared not such a blow as was given to the tender virgin; on the same account for the love of Christ, he would have bid it welcome. Faithful servants of God dread nothing, sin only excepted. Being come up to him, he said: Thou wicked man! who without any regard to innocence, or beauty, has massacred a princely virgin, no less nobly born than thyself. Nor dost thou repent, or seem sorry, as thou oughtest to do, for this horrid sacrilege. I here beseech my heavenly Lord, that for an example to others, he will please to execute his divine judgment against thee, who has murdered his spouse; troubled his people, violated his sabbath, and besprinkled this holy house with blood, which I consecrated to his service.’ As the earth swallowed up rebellious and perverse Corah, so some affirm, that at saint Beuno’s last words, Cradocus not only dropped down dead; but also that the earth opened, to give passage to the luxurious body to sink towards his monstrous soul, or that the master whom he had served, the devil carried it off; for it is certain, that the carcass of the cruel murderer never afterwards appeared.

“ The faithful glorified God in his justice, but could not curb their grief. Saint Beuno earnestly exhorted the parents and people to turn from lamentations, and to address the Creator of souls, and raiser up of dead bodies, that as he commanded back Lazarus to life, rotting in his monument, so, to his greater honour and glory, and for the comfort of the sorrowful parents, who had so generously dedicated this darling child to his service, he would graciously vouchsafe to restore her to life. He then joined the sacred head to the pale body, covering both with his cloak; after which, he offered up the holy sacrifice of our salvation.

"After mass was ended, he lifting up his hands to heaven, made the following prayer. 'O, Lord Jesus Christ! for whose sake, this holy virgin contemned the world, and languished after thee; by the tender bowels of thy mercy, love, and bounty, be graciously pleased to grant us the effect of our vows and prayers, humbly offered unto thee. We are fully persuaded, that this godly virgin, who lived holily, and died for thee with great constancy, is now highly exalted, and wants no more the society of us mortal and miserable creatures. Yet to manifest thy omnipotence and supreme dominion, which thou hast over our souls and bodies, which are never dead to thy power of reuniting them; as also to multiply the merits of that soul, whose body lies here before us: we crave a second life for her; to the end, that after a long and plentiful harvest, laden and enriched with new merits, she may return unto thee, her eternal Spouse, and the beloved of her heart; who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rulest on earth, and reignest in heaven, for ever and ever.'" The pious people, drowned in tears, having with sighs and moving sobs, answered devoutly, Amen; the virgin arose as newly awaked from sleep. She wiped her eyes and face, to clear away that glorious dust, which had settled on her lovely head, when it tumbled towards her dear saint Beuno. The decollation of saint Wenefride is celebrated on the 22d of June.

"Contemplate here, dear reader, the joy and admiration, which then transported all present, at this wonderful miracle. Tears burst out more plentifully, but flowing from a different cause. They magnified and blessed the boundless goodness of her great God, every one resolving to rise with the saint, to a newness of reforming their past lives. One particular in this surprising resuscitation is very remarkable, viz. When her parents, and others, fixed their eyes upon her neck, they observed a pure white circle, no larger than a small thread, quite round it, denoting the place, where the separation had been made; which always after remained. From this, the great veneration of the people for her, changed her name, which was Brewa, into that of Wenefride. Wen in the old British tongue signifies White, and other letters were by an alteration added to this syllable, to render more agreeable the sound of the new name. In the many apparitions after her second death, when she showed herself to her devout clients, they always took special notice of the aforesaid white circle, which intimated to them the indelible mark of her spouse's affection, for suffering that mortal wound so courageously for his sake."

We have next a few pages of what are meant for pious reflections: and certainly many of the words are such as are used in pious discourses; but considering that they are used for promoting the worship of an idol, they are nauseous as were the frantic devotions of the worshippers of the golden calf, when they said,

These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt : —

“ Whatever this incredulous age may think of this great miracle of our saint’s return to life; it appeared so evident to the West Britons, and redounded so much to the honour of God’s church, St. Beuno’s sanctity, and the power he had with his Creator, that many pagan people, remaining in those parts, came to hear the holy man’s instructions in the Catholic faith, and to receive baptism.

“ St. Wenefride, according to her former practice, like Mary at the feet of Christ, sat on a low seat before him. She was never satiated with the heavenly manna, which fell from his angelical tongue. She counted as nothing what she had already done, or suffered, and restless to be more strictly united to her beloved Spouse, she aspired to the height of perfection. Wherefore she most humbly begged upon her knees, to be solemnly veiled (according to the custom of the primitive ages) that by entering into a religious course of life, she might put hell to great confusion, which had fiercely attempted to dishonour God and herself: but mostly, that she might pour forth her soul in the presence of her eternal Spouse, with a flaming and disengaged heart, entirely his, and say; Behold I have left all things and have followed thee. (St. Matt. xix. 27.)

“ St. Beuno, with tears of joy, complied with this religious request, and performed the ceremony in a numerous assembly. He knew to what a degree of sanctity the spirit of God would raise her, for his own glory, and the improvement of others; therefore he spent whole days in cultivating her soul, in what regarded a religious state. She, as an apt scholar, took in so fast the frequent lessons, and put them in practice so punctually that it struck her master into admiration. He finding her so far advanced in an interior life, that she was even able to direct and govern others in the way of perfection; one day called for her parents, and after the following manner delivered unto them his sentiments and resolutions.

“ As you (said he) have most liberally bestowed a church and house for the service of God, and for the help and benefit of the faithful, so his Divine Majesty has more than sufficiently requited your charity, by conferring on you spiritual favours, but more especially on your child, whom for the time to come, you may follow as a safe guide, in our blessed Redeemer’s service. I am called on by heaven, to another place; and I leave you to the grace and goodness of God, and to the rare example of your daughter.” Then turning to saint Wenefride, he said, “ our Lord, dear child, has appointed you to succeed in my labours. March on in the way of virtue as I have taught you, and guide others in the road to eternal life. Gather in this very place, for your heavenly spouse, many pure and devout virgins; but know withal, that here you shall not end your days; for after the term

of seven years spent by you in prayer and austerities, for your own merits, and edification of others, our gracious Lord will summon you to another place, that strangers may be instructed by you, and come to the true knowledge and service of him, for whose sake you fell a victim of purity.

“ When the ancients of Ephesus had heard saint Paul declare unto them, that they should see no more his face, (Acts xx. 25.) they fell upon his neck, and there was great weeping. In like manner, when saint Wenefride was acquainted by her admired master, that she should not see him any more in this world, a lawful grief seemed to overwhelm her. To comfort her in such deep affliction, saint Beuno took her by the hand, and led her to the chrystalline fountain, the place of her martyrdom; where they sitting together on a stone, bearing to this day, the name of saint Beuno’s stone, and which lieth now in the outward well; ‘ you see (said he) the monument here of your sufferings. Behold also the stones, as tinctured with your blood, which was shed for the glory of your heavenly Spouse. Be you therefore attentive, and mindful of what I do foretel you, concerning three special favours, whereby your glorious spouse, Jesus Christ, will hereafter honour yourself, and by your prayers, benefit others. The first is, that these bloody spots shall never be washed off from the said stones, but ever remain, as triumphant signs of your blood, spilt in defence of your chastity. The second is, that any person who shall devoutly ask temporal blessings, or freedom from spiritual or corporeal distresses, to be obtained by your merits and intercession, the same shall compass his request, if it be to the honour and glory of God, by paying their devotions three times at this well. If what he petitions for be not for the advantage of his soul, and therefore is not granted; at his death by your prayers he shall reap more ample fruit, and in the next world everlasting blessings. The third, that after my departure into a more remote part of this island, God will give me a cell near unto the sea shore; so that whenever you send any letters or tokens to me, as I entreat you to do at least once every year, only cast them into the stream of this fountain, and they will come safe unto me. Which wonders will be gloriously divulged of you, to the end of the world.’

“ He then conducted her back to the church; where he added: ‘ Behold this church and buildings round it, which have been raised by the munificence of your parents; these I leave unto you to be converted into a monastery of chaste and holy virgins, who moved by your pious instructions and exemplary life, may put in practice those divine lessons, which I have often delivered unto you: that is, the contempt of the world, and an entire abnegation of themselves; which are the foundation of religious perfection. Strive therefore, dear child, in all things to exhibit yourself as a lively pattern of virtue. As to my poor self, I will go whither the Spirit of God shall direct me, and shall ever retain

in my heart and soul, a most fatherly and loving memory of you."

"It must not then seem strange, that the tender heart of this doleful virgin, was ready to split asunder with grief, at the last adieu in this world. The more he attempted to sweeten this bitter separation, his charming words caused her swelling sorrow to float higher; insomuch, that when she saw him, with his staff in his hand, ready to depart, she rated the approaching loss, as the heaviest cross upon earth, and could not forbear expressing thus herself unto him; "Now, holy father, I am to be left alone, as a poor orphan child without a nurse, or as a silly sheep amongst ravenous wolves, without a pastor to defend me. I was always safe with you, always joyful in your presence, always instructed by your exhortations, and edified by your example." These words attended with flowing tears, so much oppressed saint Beuno's heart, that not being able to utter any answer, he blessed her with his hand, and hastened his pace in the beginning of his journey.

"Nothing now could comfort her, save only the fresh remembrance of all his pious instructions, and an earnest desire of executing obediently his commands. Accordingly, in a short time she associated to herself many noble and devout virgins, who observed such rules as she established for them. She ordered nothing but what first she practised herself, and miracles were not wanting to increase her authority and the opinion of her sanctity. Their love and respect towards her, caused each of them to contend who should be most forward in the imitation of her rare perfections. They nauseated sordid pleasures, they undervalued wealth and honours, and they seemed to be inhabitants of a terrestrial paradise, in loving and serving their heavenly spouse, the Son of God. She governed her subjects with endearing commands, so that they obeyed with equal merit and content. She eased them in their difficulties and temptations, insomuch that they observing her rigid mortification, her angelical purity, and knowing the strict union she had with God in prayer, whatever she declared unto them was received as an oracle from heaven.

"The spreading fame of saint Wenefride was wonderfully dilated by miraculous cures of deceased persons. They were frequent and apparent, and divulged through other parts of Wales. Many flocked from distant places to hear her discourse and to receive instructions, whom she sent away with flaming hearts and ardent desires to be faithful and fervent in the service of their God. They regretted a return to their respective habitations: And as the queen of Sheba stood astonished at Solomon's singular wisdom, so these admiring strangers magnified the constant happiness of the virgins she governed, and blessed those who always stood before her (3 Kin. x. 8.) they having such a secure mistress, and so tender a mother."

THE

Protestant,

No. XLV.

SATURDAY, MAY 22d, 1819.

I AM afraid my readers will think they are entitled to an apology from me for occupying so many of my pages with the ridiculous history of the idol and saint of Wales. I am ready to allow, that the story is both ridiculous and impious, as it is intended to promote the worship of a creature, and to encourage the diseased and the miserable to trust in her for relief. If we believe the author and the editor of this work, she has performed more miracles than Christ and his apostles did; and as she is represented as still continuing to work miracles, (a thing which apostles did not pretend to after their death,) the tendency of the work evidently is, to divert the minds of the people from the doctrine of Christ as declared by his inspired messengers,—to lead them away from Christ himself, as the hope of the miserable, and to encourage them to trust in a creature; and for any thing they know, the mere creature of a monkish imagination; for her worshippers have little better evidence that such a person ever existed, than the heathen have of the existence of their idols.

Having undertaken to exhibit the true character of Popery from the writings of Papists themselves, it is necessary that I give pretty large extracts from such writings. Some of these extracts are, indeed, disgusting for their impurity, and shocking for their impiety; but this I cannot help. To get acquainted with any thing, people must see it as it is. I know that many of my readers were quite ignorant of the true character of Popery. I have undertaken to show it to them. I have, I trust, been in some degree successful, so far as I have gone. There are many Protestants that did not believe Popery to be so bad as it is. They had a general idea that it was, during the dark ages, a system of cruelty, superstition, and idolatry; but they did not believe it to be so in the present day. Now it is my object to

convince them that it *is* what it has always been. In establishing this point, considered abstractly, I have the concurrence of Popish writers themselves. They maintain that their religion is infallible and unchangeable. It cannot therefore be improved. There are many Protestants who charitably and liberally maintain that Popery is not so bad as it was; but Papists themselves spurn the compliment; and it argues a great degree of simplicity and good nature in Protestants, to persist in representing the Church of Rome as better than she wishes to be represented.

Notwithstanding all the evidence which is before the world, Papists maintain broadly that their church never was idolatrous, which is a piece of as barefaced effrontery as to maintain that she never was guilty of persecution. They believe things contrary to the evidence of their own senses; and they expect us to do the same. They believe, for instance, that what they see to be a round piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and as such they worship it with divine honour: yet they say this is not idolatry, for the priest has changed the wafer into God, though they see, and feel, and taste it to be a wafer still. This is not merely an error of the dark ages. It is taught as plainly in their modern catechisms, and believed as firmly at this day, as it was in the tenth century, when St. Dunstan preached it, and when Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed it by a miracle. (See Part I. page 39.) Now as Papists give up their senses when they believe this, we must give up our senses when we believe them not to be idolaters.

In like manner they maintain that the worship of saints is not idolatry, upon no better authority, that I know of, than that the Pope has raised them to be gods and goddesses. But while we know that they are creatures; when we read the prayers and supplications that are addressed to them; and when we find that Papists actually trust and hope in them, we must give up, not our senses only, but our reason too, before we can believe that they are not guilty of idolatry. I confess it would be extremely convenient for the cause of Popery if Protestants would be persuaded to make such a surrender;—if every one would give up his reason, and his senses, and his conscience, to the direction of holy church, Popery would soon appear among us in all *its glory*, that is, the solemn gloom of midnight darkness.

The Church of Rome in the darkest ages had its literature, such as it was. It has been held in contempt in England generally for two hundred years; but contemptible as it is, it has begun to revive. I have given extracts from the Life of St. Wenefride, for the double purpose of proving Papists to be idolaters, and affording a specimen of their literature. We are indebted to Mr. Andrews for this; and from the advertisements on the cover

of his Orthodox Journal, * I see he has published some other works calculated for the midnight meridian of Popery; and it will not be his fault if these works do not soon become as popular as their Scotch cousin, "Old Mortality," in "Tales of my Landlord."

But leaving all these things for the present, I request the attention of my readers to some farther particulars relating to the idol of Wales, the far famed St. Wenefride. It will be recollected by the readers of my last Number, that she and St. Beuno before they parted, had agreed upon a method of corresponding with each other, such as, I believe, never occurred to any two lovers whose adventures are recorded in either *profane* history or *pious* romance. When she had a letter, or any thing else to send to her beloved saint, she had only to throw it into the well, and it would reach him in safety, and free of postage, in whatever part of the world he might be at the time. Take the following proof of the fact.—

"Gratitude for received favours is not only a moral virtue, but the eternal employ of cherubims and seraphims, who are now adoring and offering never ending thanks to the infinite goodness of their omnipotent Creator, who commanded them out of the

* On the cover of his last Number are the following advertisements. I will do Mr. Andrews the favour of giving them more extensive publicity, without expense to him, which I question if any other editor in the kingdom would do.

"A new edition of *BONA MORS*; or, the art of dying happily, in the congregation of Jesus Christ crucified, and of his condoling Mother. To which is added, the *ROSARY* of our Blessed Lady. Price Tenpence, bound in sheep." From the title of this work, we learn that the "Congregation," that is the Church of Rome, is equally the property of Christ and the Virgin Mary.

"A half length Portrait of the *RIGHT REV. DR. MILNER*. Engraved in the line manner. Proofs on India Paper, Two Guineas. Prints, One Guinea.

"Two beautiful small Prints of *our Blessed Saviour and the Virgin Mary*. Proofs 5s. the pair. Prints 3s.

"A very fine head of *OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR*, crowned with thorns. 12½ inches by 16 do.—Proofs 15s. Prints 9s."

It would not perhaps be fair to infer that the prices which Mr. Andrews sets upon these respective heads, indicate the comparative value of the originals in his esteem; but one thing is certain, that Dr. Milner appears, in the Orthodox Journal, to be by far the most important personage of the three. I hope Mr. Andrews will thank me for this hint, as it will furnish him with matter for declamation about my want of candour, for two or three Numbers of *THE VINDICATOR*. This will be of the more value to him, as he must be at a loss for matter if he does not choose to answer me on the subjects of transubstantiation, and idol worship.

As I am in the way of bestowing favours on Mr. Andrews, I will inform him that I have made one real contradiction in this Number of *THE PROTESTANT*, which I hope he will be able to find out, seeing he is so quick-sighted as to find many contradictions where there are none.

chaos of nothing. St. Wenefride had a most grateful soul; she honoured St. Beuno as an eminent servant of God; she loved him as a father; she respected him as a master; and could never sufficiently acknowledge her duty to her greatest benefactor, after him who had made her. Saint Beuno delivered to her the first rudiments of perfection; he incited her to embrace a religious state; he obtained for her by his prayers a second life, and polished her interior, that she was amiable in the sight of God and men. To make some small return, she sent him every year a token, after the manner he had prescribed. In the beginning of May, almost a year after his departure, with the help of her religious sisters, she finished a curious embroidered vestment; and wrapping the same in a woollen cloth, she went down with her religious and others, to the well side, and casting the bundle into the water, she said, "Holy father, according to your command and my promise, I send unto you this small token of my love." To the great astonishment of numerous beholders, it passed down the stream into the river, then into the sea, and it landed near the monastery where saint Beuno then dwelt, many miles distant from the holy fountain.

"The holy man was then walking on the sea shore, and wondered what that bundle should be; but opening it, he remembered the charge he had given to saint Wenefride, and that, as he had foretold, it came miraculously to him, without the least sign of wet or moisture. This vestment he preserved with great care in the church, for the celebration of holy mass. He likewise received fresher lights of her present and future sanctity; how much Almighty God would be honoured by her, not only at Finhon, but in other places whither Divine Providence should direct her to go. The virgin never intermitted to send him a yearly present, till his most happy death was revealed unto her, and the glorious reward he was crowned with in heaven. This last passage may appear to incredulous persons the most surprising of all others in the history of St. Wenefride's life. Therefore Divine Providence thought fit to authenticate the memory of it to this very day, and after this manner. In Carnarvonshire, eight miles distant from the town of Carnarvon, there is a little creek where the sea runs up, called in Welsh, Porthy Casseg (corruptedly, as I could instance in other appellations) for Porthy Cassul, or the Port of the Vestment. Here the first present of our saint miraculously landed; and the place retains the name to this day. Near unto this inlet there stands a large parish church called Clynnog, in which saint Beuno was buried, his last founded monastery being there. His tomb is yet extant, and is had in great veneration by the inhabitants. The history of St. Wenefride's life was curiously represented in the glass windows of Clynnog church; but has been so defaced, that little now appears.

What can be more persuasive to obtain credit to this miracle, than so ancient and so certain a tradition, even to those who use their utmost efforts to destroy the memory of miracles. The Fort of the Vestment solves the objection from the year 660 to this of 1712. As apostolical tradition is the unwritten word of God, and by it we receive the holy Scriptures, and the sacred interpretation and true sense of them, as what regards infant baptism, &c. let it be lawful for me to say, that, as to human faith, uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history."

If any of my readers should demur to the assertion of the author, that "uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history," I must refer them to Mr. Andrews for satisfaction. He entertains, no doubt, great veneration for oral tradition, and it is evident that he believes all that is here recorded of the holy saint. He may therefore be able to satisfy others with regard to the ground of his belief, though **THE PROTESTANT** should plainly avow his infidelity.

St. Wenefride is declared to have done wonderful things at the place of her martyrdom; but what were they? I believe this is more than any body can tell. She is represented as having collected a number of young women:—as having become their governess; as teaching them the way of perfection; and as acquiring such a degree of merit in the sight of God, as to be enabled to work miraculous cures: but still the question will recur, what was it that she did? and the answer must be, Nothing. Her perfection seems to have consisted in downright inanity, and in teaching other young women to be as idle as herself. "What are you doing there, Jack?" "Nothing, Master." "And, Tom, what are you doing?" "I am helping Jack, Master." This seems to express the whole history of those godly virgins, who were associated under the government of the holy saint. These young women would have been much more profitably employed in their fathers' houses; assisting their parents in the business of their respective families; in taking husbands, and rearing families of their own, than in devoting themselves to celibacy and idleness to gratify the humour of a wandering monk. I say this upon the supposition that the story is authentic; but whether it be so or not, the revival and republication of it by Mr. Andrews, seems intended to revive the monastic spirit among our countrymen, and to encourage young women to devote themselves to a single life, by representing this as more holy and more pleasing to God than the state of marriage, which is contrary to common sense, the law of nature, and the express declaration of the word of God.

St. Wenefride, as was predicted by St. Beuno, left the place of her birth and martyrdom, and set out a-wandering, she knew not whither, which would not, in our degenerate days, be reckoned very honourable in a young lady of noble birth; but these saints, it will be said, may do any thing. She settled at last in a place called Guitherin, where there was a monastery, where she surprised all by her wonderful knowledge of heavenly mysteries, and her extraordinary sanctity; yet after reading her history, nobody can tell wherein her knowledge or her sanctity consisted. Yet she was a person of uncommon *merit* in the sight of God, insomuch that while living, and after death, she could procure by her prayers whatever she asked of him. This is the bane and the poison of those books which Mr. Andrews is reprinting for the instruction, I should rather say the destruction, of the rising generation. They are not only calculated to conceal the truth of God's word from the mind of the reader, but by making use of certain expressions borrowed from the word of God, they convey sentiments directly opposed to it. They exalt the merits of a creature; they put an idol in the place of the Saviour; and then they pervert and prostitute his own word to give credit to the imposture.

My readers must excuse me for occupying so much of their time with such stuff as St. Wenefride. Had I found her history in some old musty volume, which was not likely ever to be reprinted, I would have made shorter extracts, and have dismissed her with little ceremony, under an apprehension, perhaps, that the world would never hear of her again; but since the organ of English Papists in London, has reprinted the work in a cheap form; seeing it has the sanction of Dr. Milner, Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic, so far as to allow his name to be used as a voucher for a miracle lately performed by the holy saint, who died for the second time above eleven hundred years ago; seeing this work is strongly recommended by the editor, and is likely to obtain extensive circulation among English Papists, and perhaps Protestants, I think it of importance to my readers to be acquainted with the nature of the work, and the doctrines which it inculcates, which are throughout impious and idolatrous, yet expressed in language that wears an air of piety, and therefore more likely to deceive the simple and unwary. This is the sort of reading which Papists are providing for the many thousands of their children, who, at the expense of Protestants, are learning to read; and unless they are furnished with something better; unless the Bible is put into their hands, it may turn out that all our efforts to educate the Popish youth will have the effect of making them more subtle and confirmed idolaters.

I could tell how the bones of this saint were dug up and transported to Shrewsbury, some hundreds of years after her

death;—of the miracles which these bones performed at the time of their translation, of which Robertus Salopiensis was an eyewitness; but I must pass over these trivial matters, and come to things of more importance.

Christians, whose religion is derived from the Bible, believe that saints who have departed this life, are at rest with their Saviour in heaven, and that they have done with worldly cares. They believe that Christ himself has all power in heaven and earth, that he alone is intrusted with the management of his church, and that he takes a particular interest in the happiness of every individual member. But the poor slaves of Rome cannot look so high for protection and comfort. They are taught to trust in some fellow creature of a saint, or in a company of saints, whose souls are supposed to be still ready to go about any business which their worshippers have in heaven: and their bodies, even to the least of their bones, nay their very clothes, and even the thongs which have tied their shoes, can perform wonderful cures on earth.

But as no one saint, except the Virgin Mary, can do every thing, and be in all places at the same time, the Church of Rome has made a very convenient distribution, and as distinct a division of labour among the saints in heaven, as any manufacturer on earth can make among his artificers. By this imaginary distribution, they first divide their saints into countries. St. James is appointed to take care of Spain: St. Sebastin has the charge of Portugal: St. Denis of France: St. Mark of the Venetians: St. Nicholas of the Moscovites: St. Ambrose of Milan: the three Kings of the electorate of Cologne: St. Barbara of Germany, &c. Before the Reformation, St. George had the charge of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, and St. Patrick of Ireland.

Secondly, they subdivide the employment of the saints in these and other countries, after the several sorts of trades and professions of the people. St. Nicholas and St. Christopher have the oversight of seamen; St. Catherine is over the scholars; St. Austin takes care of the divines: St. Luke of the painters; St. Ivo of the lawyers; St. Eustachius of the hunters; St. Crispin of the shoemakers; St. Magdalene and St. Afra have the charge of those unhappy women who are no better than they should be. Some are even put to the most vile and degrading services; for instance, St. Anthony has the charge of swine; St. Pelagius of cows; St. Eulogius of horses; St. Vendeline and St. Gallus have the care of both sheep and geese. What mean ideas must the poor Papists have of heaven, when they suppose the saints would leave it to drudge after such matters?

The division of labour among the saints which is appointed by the Church of Rome, is very much like that of the servants in a great house or palace, such for instance, as Holyrood house

in Edinburgh, where one servant is not allowed to show the whole building to a stranger; but where different persons are in waiting, with the keys of their respective apartments; one shows you a suite of rooms, receives his fee, and turns you over to another, who shows you the great gallery of paintings; he having received his fee, turns you over to an old woman, who shows you the ruins of the chapel, and the shank-bone of Darnly, and she also must have her fee;—such at least was the practice twenty years ago; and such is the *canonical* practice of Romish saints in all ages. *Non omnia possumus omnes*,—one cannot do all, says one of their learned men; (Gab. Biel. in can. lect. 32.) and therefore they will sometimes direct clients to other saints; as once St. Peter sent a woman to a sacrist he had at Rome, for the cure of her palsy; and it is upon this ground, that devout persons are directed to several saints for their several exigencies, to the end that every saint may have his share in the worship. This they call a discreet variety, honourable to the church and advantageous to her poor members. One prays to St. Peter for the gift of submission: to St. Agnes for continency: to our Lady St. Ann for wealth: to St. Margarite for child-bearing: to St. Rochus against the plague: to St. Petronilla against the ague: to St. Apollonia against the toothach: to St. Liberius against the stone: and so to every saint for the help that is in his way. Bachelors must not go to St. Peter, because he was a married man; nor married nien to St. John, because he was a bachelor: but let every one go to a saint of his own tribe; a widow to a widow saint, and a soldier to one of his trade, for this is the humour of Romish saints, to favour their own companions.

According to this economy, there is not one Romanist but may pretend to march under the colours of several saints. For example, a native of Paris has as fair a title as Rome can give to the protection of St. Michael, St. Denis, and our Lady, who are understood to rule that kingdom: of St. Genevieve, that more especially looks to Paris; of St. Germain, or St. Thomas, or St. Sulpice, if he either be born or reside in these parishes: of St. Cosmus, and St. Damian, if he practice physic: of St. Otilia and St. Lucia, when his ears and eyes trouble him; and of St. Mathurin also, if he be troubled with folly. Over and above these, he may be sure of other saints, St. Dominick, St. Celestin, St. Francis, and twenty more, by matriculating his name into their confraternities, which he may do for a small matter. *See Bel. de Sanct. Beati.*—Gab. Biel.—*Salmero 1 ad Tim.*—*Salazar, Prov. cap. 8. v. 18. &c. &c. as referred to by Brevint in Saul and Samuel at Endor. pp. 72—74*

THE

Protestant,

No. XLVI.

SATURDAY, MAY 29th, 1819.

WHAT the Church of Rome calls a discreet variety in her objects of worship, could produce nothing but confusion and distraction in the minds of those who know what real religious worship is. It is the glory of Christianity, as opposed to all idolatry, that it teaches the worship of one living and true God, and that it makes known to the guilty children of men the way of access to him, by one Mediator, who has made atonement for the sins of his people; who is worthy to stand between an offended God and his offending creatures,—to make intercession for the latter, and to bring them into the blessed state of reconciliation with their Creator. Christ having made peace by the blood of his cross, came and preached peace to the Gentiles who were far off, as well as to the Jews who were nigh; for through him, both Jews and Gentiles have access by one Spirit unto the Father, Eph. ii. 17, 18. Those who believe in Christ, that is, those who are really Christians, are brought into this state of peace and reconciliation with God. They trust in God, and hope in him. They are instructed, in every thing, by prayers and supplications, to make their requests known unto God, Phil. iv. 6. Nay, they are invited to come boldly to the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help them in time of need, Heb. iv. 16. They possess a confidence and steadfast reliance upon him as their Almighty Saviour, and all-sufficient portion. Their confidence is that of children in a father whom they love, and whom they know loves them. To send them to a creature for help, be that creature ever so exalted, would be to seduce them from their allegiance to their God and Father;—a crime that can find a parallel only in the

successful attempt of the Devil against our first parents; and a crime in which the Church of Rome has been deplorably successful, to the ruin of millions of immortal souls.

Popish worship is not the affectionate approach of a child to a gracious father, but the sullen averted look of a slave, who dares not approach his master but through the medium of some fellow creature, who, he supposes, stands higher in favour than himself, and whose good word, he thinks, will promote his interest with his master. I need not tell those who understand the Bible, that this is not the worship of the true God at all. To say that God is too great to admit of direct approach in the name of Christ, and that he is accessible to sinners through the medium of mere creatures, is a false representation of him; and to worship the true God under a false character is as really idolatry as to worship a false God. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and this is not merely a human error grafted upon a divine religion, as some of their fooleries are supposed to be. It is a radical and fundamental error, which declares Popery to be quite a different, and an opposite religion;—to be, in short, that Antichrist that should come into the world.

In lieu of that spiritual divine worship which is enjoined by the word of God, Papists are taught to worship they know not what; and they are so madly set upon their idols, that they have multiplied to themselves gods, more than the heathen whom they have supplanted. Not satisfied with those who are known to have been saints on earth, and who we believe are now glorified in heaven, such as the Apostles of Christ, they have added multitudes of names whose saintship and whose very existence is doubtful: to these they address their idolatrous prayers and supplications; and in these they put their trust for preservation from evil, and for obtaining both temporal and spiritual benefits.

That Papists are taught to worship they know not what, is evident from their worshipping certain saints of whose existence there is not the shadow of evidence, which comes directly under the Apostle Paul's description of an idol,—that it is nothing in the world.

“The Spaniards, it seems, have a saint held in great reverence, in some parts of Spain, called VIAR; for the farther encouragement of whose worship, they solicited the Pope to grant some special indulgences to his altars; and upon the Pope's desiring to be better acquainted first with his character, and the proofs which they had of his saintship, they produced a stone with these antique letters S. VIAR which the antiquaries readily saw to be a small fragment of some old Roman inscription in memory of one who had been *Prefectus VIARUM*, or overseer of the highways.” *Middleton's Letters*, p. 173.

This St. Viar, or Viarius, was, notwithstanding, worshipped for I do not know how many ages. "Over the bishop's sepulchre is a table of stone, upon which the mass was wont to be sacrificed in honour of his saintship, whom they call Viarius; and hither came all persons who were pained about the loins, and were invariably cured. When Ressendius, who designed to publish his life along with those of the other saints, visited the spot with a view to pick up information, he enquired of the priests if they possessed any records or inscriptions respecting St. Viarius. Upon this he was directed to the table over his sepulchre; which was inscribed with a Latin epitaph of considerable length. But Ressendius, who happened to be better acquainted with Latin inscriptions than the priests, soon discovered that the celebrated tomb of St. Viarius contained only the heathenish carcases of two menders of Roman highways. Information was immediately sent to Cardinal Alphonsus, at that time Bishop of Evora, who ordered the place to be shut up, to the great discontent of all the simple faithful who were pained about the loins." *M'Culloch Pop. Cond. p. 345.* "Such legendary lore drew from a learned man of the Romish Church the following complaint. 'There is also another error not unfrequent, that the common people, neglecting in a manner the ancient and known saints, worship more ardently the new and unknown, of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and of whom we know some only by revelations; so that it is justly doubted or several; that they never existed at all.'" *Cassand. Consult. p. 971. quoted by M'Culloch, p. 346.* This is an important concession by a Popish writer. He speaks as if it were universally admitted that the ancient and known saints should be worshipped; he finds fault only with the prevailing practice of worshipping those upstart saints who were unknown, and of whose existence there was no evidence.

"We have in England," says Middleton, p. 174, "an instance still more ridiculous, of a fictitious saintship, in the case of a certain saint called Amphibolus; who, according to monkish historians, was bishop of the Isle of Man, and fellow-martyr and disciple of St. Alban: yet the learned Bishop Usher has given good reasons to convince us, that he owes the honour of his saintship to a mistaken passage in old acts or legends of St. Alban: where the Amphibolus mentioned, and since revered as a saint and martyr, was nothing more than a cloak, which Alban happened to have, at the time of his execution; being a word derived from the Greek, and signifying a rough shaggy cloak, which ecclesiastical persons usually wore in that age." *Middleton p. 174.*

"They pretend to show here at Rome," says the same au-

thor, "two original impressions of our Saviour's face, on two different handkerchiefs; the one, sent a present by himself to Agbarus, Prince of Edessa, who by letter had desired a picture of him; the other, given by him at the time of his execution, to a saint or holy woman named Veronica, upon a handkerchief which she had lent him to wipe his face on that occasion: both which handkerchiefs are still preserved, as they affirm, and now kept with much reverence; the first in St. Sylvester's church; the second in St. Peter's; where in honour of this sacred relic, there is a fine altar, built by Pope Urban VIII. with a statue of Veronica herself."* "But, notwithstanding the authority of the Pope, and his inscription, this VERONICA, as one of their best authors has shown, like Amphibolus before mentioned, was not any real person, but the name given to the picture itself, by the old writers who mention it; being formed by blundering and confounding the words VERA ICON, or *true image*, the title inscribed, perhaps, or given originally to the handkerchief, by the first contrivers of the imposture." page 176.

Thus, in their rage for multiplying objects of worship, Papists have set up some that never had any real existence. This is no less impious and absurd than the conduct of the grossest idolaters among savage tribes, who worship a piece of wood or a piece of stone. These worship the works which their own hands have made; Papists worship the creatures which their own imaginations have formed: and there is this difference in favour of the savages, that they have not the means of knowing better; while the Papists continue their idolatries notwithstanding the enlightened state of Europe, and the repeated exposure which has been made of their absurdities and impieties.

But I cannot allow Papists even the small advantage of being more intellectual in their idolatries than the untutored savage; for they do worship wood, and stone, and paste, which their own hands have made. They have not only set up idols which they call saints, but they have set up images of these saints, and they fall down and worship before them. Nay, so far do they degrade themselves, that they worship "cast clouts and old rotten rags," if they can persuade themselves that these were part of the clothing, or had touched the body of any of their idols. But as the subject of worshipping images and relics de-

* There is a Latin inscription which it is unnecessary to quote here. The following is a note by the author.—"There is a prayer in their books of offices, ordered by the rubric, to be addressed to this sacred and miraculous picture, in the following terms.—'Conduct us, O thou blessed figure, to our proper home, where we may behold the pure face of Christ.'"

serves the honour of a Paper by itself, I shall not enter upon it here.

I have just said that to worship the true God under a false character, is as really idolatry as to worship a false god; and I intend to dilate a little on this subject, as it is one of great importance; and as I am afraid many, who are not Papists, will be convicted of this error.

All true and acceptable worship proceeds from the true knowledge of the object of worship. He that cometh to God must not only believe in his existence, but must believe that of him which he has been pleased to reveal in his word; he must know his true character as it is there exhibited; and if any man profess to approach to him without this knowledge and belief, he is not approaching to the true God, but to an idol of his own fancy. He may form in his own mind an idea of that great Being to whom he addresses himself; but if his idea of God be not that which is declared by his own word,—that which is exhibited in such endearing characters in the gospel of Christ, it is not the God of the Bible whom he is worshipping; and as there is no other living and true God, he is worshipping an idol,—a thing that has no existence.

It is only in the gospel of Christ that God is represented in such characters as to warrant and encourage us to approach to him, and to worship him with the hope of being accepted. We must not forget that we are estranged from God, and enemies to him; and that he is justly offended with us. In this state of estrangement there can be no friendly intercourse between heaven and earth. We cannot approach to him as holy angels, who never offended him, do; nor will he accept of the homage or worship of enemies and rebels. This is the state in which the gospel finds the whole human race: and this message of mercy makes known the expedient devised by infinite wisdom for effecting our reconciliation. This was no less than the gift of his own Son; he gave him up to the death to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness. Every man who believes this on the authority of the divine record, and submits to the righteousness of God, has his sins forgiven; he is reconciled; he receives a new heart and a right spirit; and in the exercise of faith and cordial repentance on account of his many transgressions, he is enabled, by divine grace, to worship God in simplicity and godly sincerity. Such worship is graciously accepted. Jesus Christ is the only medium of it. He is the one Mediator between God and man. His righteousness alone is the footing on which our persons and services are accepted; and his intercession alone is available to our spiritual advantage.

I am aware that every Papist, and many a nominal Protestant, will cry out against this as cant and nonsense. No matter: It is just what the plain truth of divine revelation has been from the beginning of the world, in the esteem of those who did not like to worship God in the way which he himself had prescribed; who in fact did not like to retain God in their knowledge, in those characters of infinite holiness and righteousness, under which he had revealed himself, and which would not admit the approach of any of the race of Adam, but by confession of guilt over a sacrifice of atonement.

Sinners, as such, never did like this view of the divine character; and yet if they profess to worship God under any other character, they are worshipping an idol, and not the true God. Cain seems to have been the first avowed idolater; and his idolatry consisted in presenting an offering to the true God under a false character. The divine appointment of worship by sacrifice, was a sufficiently plain intimation, that God was so offended with men on account of sin, that no man should ever approach to him but upon the footing of an atonement. But Cain did not believe that God was so offended with *him*, that he might not come to him as a friend, without a sacrifice,—without a reconciliation. It was not therefore the true God that Cain was thinking of; it was an idol of his own imagination; and this I take to be the origin of all the idolatry that has been in the world.

It was long, perhaps, before the impression of the revelation which God made of himself to the first family, and before the religion of that family, were so completely forgotten, that idolatry acquired the grossness of avowed creature worship; yet we know that in process of time the earth was filled with it. So after God was manifest in the flesh; after the great atonement had been made; after all men were invited to confess their sins, and come to God for pardon upon the footing of that sacrifice; and after many churches had been gathered by the preaching of Apostles, built upon the foundation of the truth which they preached, and professing to worship God in the name of Jesus Christ; it was some time, I say, after this, before idolatry began to appear in the grossness of creature worship. It soon appeared in its more refined and intellectual form, when some Jewish converts began to make an idol of their conformity to the law of Moses, and when others became ashamed of the doctrine of Christ, and began to corrupt it by inventions and traditions of men. This, though perceptible at first only to the keen spiritual discernment of inspired men, became by degrees palpable enough; and in the course of a few ages, it issued in the gross idolatries of the Church of Rome, and the scarcely less gross superstitions of the Eastern churches.

There is in the mind of every real Christian a representation of the true God in his revealed characters of goodness and truth, justice and mercy. This is produced by the gospel which he believes; and, continuing in the faith of it, this representation, or image of the living God remains within him. But there are many who receive the gospel only in theory, not in the love of it, and without any experience of its power and sanctifying influence; and there are many, called Christians, who do not know the gospel even in theory. In the minds of both these classes of persons there is an image of something else than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: it is the image of an idol which they have set up in their own hearts; and all the worship of such persons is no better than idolatry. For instance, if a man shall imagine that God will accept him upon the footing of his own merits; that God is too good to be strict in marking his failings and imperfections; that he will kindly pass over these, without putting him to the disagreeable necessity of confessing and forsaking his sins, and imploring mercy in the name of Christ;—such a man is thinking of an idol; his heart is as far removed from the true God as that of the deluded Papist, who worships a fragment of the handkerchief of the Virgin Mary, or the poor Hindoo, who falls down before the image of Jugger-naut.

I have a good deal to say on the conformity of Popery with heathen idolatry; but the design of the present reflections is to show its conformity with the state of the carnal mind; and that it rises out of that alienation of the heart from the true God, and dislike of his revealed character, which exists in the heart of every man until he is converted to God by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the instrumentality of the gospel.

But when persons have obtained the name of Christian, they do not like to give it up. In countries where Christianity is not persecuted, especially where it is the prevailing and established religion, men may depart from the faith of Christ, and still be called by his name. They call themselves Christians, and their children will be called Christians, though not united to Christ by the faith of the gospel. The living image of Christ is wanting in the hearts of such persons, and they must have something external and visible to supply its place; such, for instance, as a dead image of him which they set up in their churches. They abandon the doctrine of the cross of Christ; but they find a substitute in the timber or image of the cross. Not aware of the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit, to regenerate and sanctify them, they rest satisfied with the act of baptism and the application of holy water. Not receiving Christ by faith in the ordinance which commemorates his death, they are content

to receive an image of him in the form of a wafer. The light of the divine word no longer shining from their pulpits, they supply its place by a number of wax candles, even in the face of the sun; and the priests, no longer exhibiting the character of heavenly purity, they clothe themselves with an image of it in the form of a robe of white linen. In this way the doctrines and ordinances of Christ were not merely corrupted, but totally supplanted, by a system of idolatries, and superstitions, and will-worship, which continues to this day to obstruct the progress of the gospel, and to enslave the minds of many millions of the human race.

Now I wish to be understood as distinctly maintaining that there is a tendency to these things in the minds of all who are Christians in name, and not in reality. Where the living spirit of Christianity is a-wanting, men will take up with a dead image of it. If they receive not the gospel in its heavenly simplicity, they will be led away by some earthly representation of it. If they receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, they may be abandoned to the fatal delusion of believing a lie. The first speculative error may appear small and trifling, but nobody can tell how far it may lead one astray. One degree of obliquity extended, will lead to an infinite distance from the right line. Rome was not built in a day. Admit but the principle, that any thing beside what is contained in the word of God, is to be a rule in religious matters, and this, in the course of time, will lead the minds of men entirely away from the word of God, as it did in the Church of Rome, and issue in a system of direct opposition to the divine record.

Let such of my readers as are alarmed for the growth of Popery attend to the root of the evil. It lies in the opposition of the carnal mind to the holy and humbling doctrine of Christ crucified. It is highly probable that if Popery shall regain the ascendancy among us, and become the fashionable religion, the worldly part of the community will fall into it; because the fundamental principles of Popery and mere nominal Christianity are the same. If any of my readers ask how the growth of Popery is to be prevented; I confess I know no proper means of prevention, but by every one receiving and holding fast the truth of the divine word; and by communicating the knowledge of it to all around him. It is only by the word of truth, and the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, that Christians can effectually oppose the progress of error; and such opposition, by the blessing of God, will ultimately be successful, even if Popery should gain the ascendancy for a time.

THE

Protestant,

No. XLVII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 5th, 1819.

“**BEATIFICATION**,” says Dr. Johnson in his Dictionary, “is an acknowledgment made by the Pope, that the person beatified is in heaven, and therefore may be revered as blessed; but is not a concession of the honours due to saints which are conferred by canonization.” If this be a correct definition of the word, which I have no reason to doubt, it appears that the Pope professes to have the faculty of knowing who are in heaven, and who are not, which must excite as great a degree of astonishment, as that of the village rustics at their learned schoolmaster, “That one small head could carry all he knew.” It appears farther, that every saint in heaven *may* be revered as blessed, that is, honoured with an inferior degree of worship; but that to those whom the Pope has canonized a higher degree of worship is *due*. It is not then a matter of mere choice; it is a matter of *obligation*; it is the bounden duty of every good papist to worship the idols which the Pope has *set up*; that is, the saints to whom he has given places of distinction in heaven. Mr. Andrews very earnestly inculcates this duty in his school book, as it regards the Virgin Mary; and in his edition of St. Wenefride’s life and miracles, he is little less earnest in recommending devotion to her. At least he holds her up as an object of religious worship; as one that is able to bestow the greatest temporal blessings, such as the cure of diseases which no human skill can cure; and he furnishes suitable prayers for the use of her devout worshippers, on whom she has not bestowed the ability to make prayers for themselves.

Those who have marked the correspondence that there is between heathenism and popery, have been struck with the resemblance of Popish canonization to heathen deification. “The ancient priests, in order to the credit of their system, felt it

necessary to persuade the people, that certain characters, many of whom had, however, been the most ambitious and sensual of mankind, were honoured by the special favour of heaven; were deep in its mysteries; and even worthy of being placed among the gods themselves: in consequence of which, their public deification took place with all the pomp and circumstance so well calculated to impose upon a gross and idolatrous people. In order, however, to this ceremony, some miraculous intimation of the favour and will of Heaven, as to the individual in question, was required to be duly attested as necessary to the ceremony. Thus in the case of Romulus, one Julius Proculus took a solemn oath, 'That Romulus himself appeared to him, and ordered him to inform the senate of his being called up to the assembly of the gods, under the name of Quirinus.' *Plut. in Vit. Rom. Dioniss. Halicar.* l. ii. p. 124. and in the deification of the Cæsars, some of whom were little less than monsters, the established proof of their divinity was an eagle flying out of the funeral pile towards heaven, which was supposed to convey the soul of the deceased, and was also required to be duly attested." *Dio. Cass.* p. 598, 842. The Papists, in imitation of this Pagan original, consider it necessary to their credit, to canonize or beatify certain individuals of their communion, some of whom have, like their heathen prototypes, been of infamous and scandalous lives; and in order to this act, they also introduce the machinery of miracles, although with some difference as to the mode of its operation. In this case, the miracles are alledged to have been performed by the saints themselves, and there is as little difficulty in procuring the necessary attestations in modern as in ancient Rome. The creation of saints has in consequence become almost as common as the creation of cardinals, there having rarely been a Pope who did not enrich the calendar with some fresh specimens. Benedict XIII. canonized eight in one summer, and his successor Clement XII. four more. Innocent XIII., who succeeded him, beatified Andrew Conti, a member of his own family: and this is another main source of saintship, when, to gratify the ambition of the reigning Pope, this honour is conferred on some of his name or family. The present Pope has canonized five saints, all of whose banners are at this moment waving in one of the chapels of St. Peter's. The Papists consider this rite as so essential a part of their religion, that they have even perverted the sacred Scriptures for the purpose of giving sanction to the practice, having translated the passage in St. James, v. 11, not as it ought to be: 'Behold we count them happy who endure,' but 'Behold how we *beatify* those who have suffered with constancy;' in like manner as, in order to give a sanction to their religious processions with the host and with relics, &c. they translate the passage in Heb. xi. 30, 'The walls of Jericho fell down after they were compassed about seven days,' 'after a *procession* of seven days.'

“ It costs an immense sum to be made a saint, but pious relatives are sometimes content to bear it. Proofs of the miracles wrought by the deceased must be adduced in due form, in a judicial way. Witnesses are examined, and in order that full justice may be done, counsel are appointed on both sides, one undertaking to establish the miracles, and the other combating them; and thus the matter is solemnly argued *dans les formes, et selon les regles*, and not determined until after a long and expensive process. It is farther remarkable, that some miracle must have been performed by the deceased *after his death*, as well as during his life; one of these, by the way, being quite as easy to the saint as the other, and each being equally capable of proof. It is unnecessary to observe, that these judicial inquiries invariably terminate in favour of the saint and his family; since the Pope and his council are equally interested in the successful issue of the suit: indeed, as an atheistical Pope once observed, ‘ What a profitable fable has that of Jesus Christ been to us!’ ”

IGNOTUS, *Letter V. originally published in the Times Newspaper*. Whence is it that Mr. Andrews has not tried his hand in answering this able writer, who has made such an exposure of the wickedness of Popery, and its dangerous tendency, under his own eye?

One of the most usual miracles which saints are said to perform after their death, is to impart to their carcases a good smell; and it is so much the better if they can preserve this for ages, so that on opening their graves all present should be sensible of it. I have before me a number of particulars of the life and miracles of St. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, whose Bull of canonization “ begins not without good reason,” as the author says, “ with that incorruption and good odour of her body which continues to this day.” It is easy to imagine how a parcel of artful monks, by the use of perfumes, might deceive the simple, and impart fragrance to the body of one recently deceased, and even to a chestful of dry bones; and thus it was in their power to lay a foundation for the canonization of any person they pleased. The following is one of the miracles which procured this honour for the idol of Pazzi:—“ Then, when her virgin body was after her death exposed in the church, there was a concourse of people of all ages, sexes, and qualities to see it, touch it, and pay veneration to it. Among others, a young man of an irregular and licentious life, advanced towards the body to touch it. The saint, as if she had been alive, had a horror of that dunghill, and turned her head on the other side. This action touched the young man so to the quick, that he made a firm resolution to amend. This miracle was attested by a reverend Jesuit, who was an eye-witness of it, with many others.” I dare not give more particulars of this saint, lest my readers should throw my Paper aside with disgust. Suffice it to say that the story is much more gross than St. Wenefride. St. Mary Magdalene

of Pazzi, however, has a distinguished place among the idols of Papal Rome; and I have received from an intelligent correspondent, an impression of a little image of her, such as her devotees wear about their neck.

I related in my last Number how St. Viar was unsainted when it was discovered that he had been no better than a mender of roads, though I believe few of the saints were so honourably and usefully employed. I shall now give an account of one who was in danger of being deprived, and struck from the calendar, had the credit of his saintship not been established by the smell of his bones. The relation is given by one who was an eye-witness of this, and of innumerable other Popish tricks to deceive the people, and who afterwards was so convinced of the iniquity of the system that he renounced it and embraced the Protestant faith. This, of course, will overthrow his credit with every good Papist, and every fact of his will be called a forgery, though he relates nothing worse than what can be proved by a hundred other witnesses. It is a rule with writers of controversy on the Popish side that nothing is to be believed that is written by a Protestant, unless he be such a one as Heylen, the companion of Laud, who was more than three-fourths a Papist.

"I can give you on this subject," says the writer in a letter to a friend, "the result of a conference, at which I was present myself, sometime ago, at Blois in France, upon occasion of several relics kept in the parish of St. Victor, two leagues distant from that city. These relics were much out of order, in old wooden cases, all worm eaten and rotten with age, which hindered them from being carried in procession, and exposed to public view. The concern, therefore, was to have them more modestly accommodated, and transported into new cases. To this end the Bishop of Chartres was petitioned to perform the translation, who presently sent his order to the Archdeacon of Blois for that purpose; who assembled several of the clergy to consult with the curates and priests of St. Victor about the precautions to be observed in that translation. The resolution was, that to avoid the scandal that might happen, if nothing should chance to be found in the old cases, and to prevent the declining of the good opinion and devotion of the people, in case only some few bones should be found in them, the transportation of them into the new ones should not be done in public, but as private as possibly might be, in the presence of only some prudent persons, who might be ready to remedy all sorts of accidents upon occasion: I was desired by some friends of the Archdeacon, to be present with them; and I can assure you, sir, that the resolution was taken, if it should chance that nothing were found in the cases, to maintain peremptorily *that the bodies of the saints were there whole and entire*. And to allay somewhat the scruples that might start by occasion of this proceeding, a Canon of St. Saviour's church of Blois, a man re-

absolute and of a small conscience, maintained in the face of the assembly, that no difficulty ought to be made of asserting such a thing, though altogether false: that in a case where the interest of the church was concerned, all manner of respects and sentiments whatsoever were to be given up; that the mysteries of the Catholics were not to be exposed to the raillery of the hereticks, (so they call the Protestants) who would not fail to mock at them, as soon as they should understand that nothing had been found in the cases of St. Victor, which for so long a time had been the object of the people's adoration; besides, that the devotion of laics, in assisting the clergy, was already so far cooled, that scarce any thing now was to be got from them, but by some pious fraud or holy artifice. The Archdeacon heard all his discourse without contradicting him in the least; and the curate of the parish, as being the person most concerned in the case, very officiously returned him his most hearty thanks. This done, they proceeded to the opening of the cases; and the truth is, bones either of saints or no-saints were found in them. In the mean time, a monk of the Abbey of St. Lomer in Blois, who was present, cried out at the very instant, that he felt a very sweet odour which proceeded from them, wherewith he was so strongly seized, that it was like to overcome him. A young religious, (his companion) seconded him immediately, and some country people of the parish protested the very same thing. The Archdeacon, and the rest of the company freely declared, that they smelt nothing: yet forasmuch as it might be, that those persons having some more particular merit before God, he might think them worthy of receiving the like favours; it was ordered that their attestation should be received, and set in the margin of the verbal process which was then making of that translation, the original of which was to be shut up with the relics in the new cases. I had the curiosity some weeks after, in the time of vintage, to examine some of these persons about the odour they pretended to have smelt, of what kind it was; whereupon some of them said it was the scent of a rose, others of jessamin, and others of violet: but finding that they faltered in their expressions, and smiled withal, I took occasion to press them more seriously, so that at the upshot they confessed, that the good opinion they had of the two monks, which first started the matter, had drawn them in, and in a manner forced their imagination to believe, that they smelt that which they never had smelt indeed." *Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests*, vol. I. p. 8—10.

The author has a round about way of telling his story, on which account I will give the sequel in my own way. He got the young monk to confess that he had smelt nothing of the miraculous odour; but being ashamed to be supposed less gifted with heavenly favours than his brother, he had pretended to be sensible of it. He acknowledged, (being a young unexperienced

man) that he had had some qualms of conscience on account of what he had done, that he had consulted his superiors about the matter, and that they told him the rule in such cases was, to consider whether the thing was for the glory of God, and the advantage of the order to which he belonged. They did not hesitate to affirm "that it was not against the glory of God to advance the honour of one of his saints, especially when some circumstances that were both glorious and profitable to that order, engaged the doing of it; and that all the evil that could be supposed in the case, came but to this, to say, that God had done what he might have done, and which he hath done on many other occasions; which at the highest could be no more than a small venial sin; as, they say, all lies are, that do not infringe justice, that is to say, that do nobody any harm." It was impossible, however, to make the old monk depart from his first declaration. He persisted in maintaining that the odour had not only been smelled by him at the opening of the chest, but that it had followed him every where so long as a particle of the dust of the relics remained upon his clothes. Thus St. Victor's saintship was confirmed; and he remains in the calendar an object of worship to all the simple faithful who cannot raise their minds to a higher object.

I give the following as a specimen of the process of canonization. I could produce a number of such cases; but let this one suffice. "On the 12th of May, 1707, a general congregation to confer upon the rights of the church, having been summoned by the Pope's order, wherein Cardinal Pamphilio required their approbation of the miracles wrought by Andrew Avellino, of the order of the Theatines. These miracles were eight in number; of which, after a full and serious disquisition, the three following were solemnly ratified by the general consent and concurrent votes of the whole congregation, viz. The third, which was the first in order, being a cure performed on the person of Jacob Giovio, who was miraculously restored to the entire use of his limbs by the said Andrew Avellino, though his sinews had been shrunk, and a deadly palsy had seized one side of his body. The next was the fourth in order, namely, the healing a dangerous wound John Battista Corrizo had received in his head; and that without the appearance of the least mark or scar. The last was the restoring Scipio Arleo's child to health, by curing it of a great bruise in its forehead, and of a wry neck.

"As these miracles were the fruits of his most exemplary piety, and heroic virtues, the holy assembly being authorised to it by the consent and directions of His Holiness, declared, that in conformity to the customs of the holy Roman Church, and by the authority of the same, the forenamed Andrew Avellino might and ought to be deemed a saint, and be canonized accordingly." *Romish Ecclesiastical History of late years, p. 6.*

This Andrew Avellino was accordingly canonized, along with

several others, with much pomp and ceremony; and became of course an object of that religious worship which is *due* to those idols which the Pope has set up. It is, indeed, only that sort of worship which they call *dulia*; but as I have shown in a former Number, the distinction between this and *latria* is absolutely unintelligible to the unlearned, and perhaps also the learned themselves. Let them say what they will in theory, this is practically the adoration of a creature; it is trust or confidence in a creature, which is, in scripture, condemned as a departing from the living God. Let a person go into one of their great churches, where there are a number of altars: before one altar he will see a group of prostrate worshippers praying, Holy Jesus, have mercy upon us; before another altar, a group, praying, Holy Mary, have mercy upon us; before a third altar, the prayer is, Holy St. Peter have mercy upon us; and so on, before all the altars that are dedicated to all the saints: nay, the same individual will pay his devotions at several altars the same day, not sure that he will succeed in his suit at any one altar, or by addressing one saint; he makes it as sure as possible by addressing as many as he can, or as many as he can afford to pay, for no one must approach an altar without a gift. Now when the same words are addressed to the different objects of worship, with the same apparent devotion, who is able to distinguish between *latria*, *dulia*, and *hyperdulia*? Nay, let any man consider the following extract from a prayer which Mr. Andrews has provided for the devout worshippers of St. Wenefride, and say if stronger words can be used in addressing the supreme Deity. “O blessed St. Wenefride, hear the prayers and receive the humble supplications of thy devout pilgrims, and obtain, that by thy pious intercession, God of his infinite mercy will be pleased to grant us a full pardon and remission of our sins, and a blessing to this our pilgrimage; and that we may increase and persevere in God’s grace, and enjoy him eternally in heaven. *This we beg of thee, O blessed virgin and martyr*, for Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour’s sake. Amen.” In the beginning of this extract, the saint is addressed as mediator with God, to procure blessings by her pious intercession; at the close of the prayer, Jesus Christ is represented as mediator with her, and she is intreated to grant the blessings for his sake, which is actually putting her in the place of God the Father. My readers, I am afraid, will scarcely believe that such impiety exists in the present day, but I assure them that the above are the concluding words of a book printed in 1817, and strongly recommended by W. Eusebius Andrews.

I have met with no Popish writer who can explain to me how they get their prayers conveyed to the saints in heaven, or how they know that they reach that place. As I conferred several favours on Mr. Andrews in my last Number but one, I request of him the favour of a Paper or two on this subject. I must

suppose, that he very piously makes use of the prayers which he has composed for the worshippers of his favourite idol, St. Wenefride; and he must know that a number of pilgrims are every day paying their devotions at her holy well: now I ask him seriously, how she can attend to all the prayers of these pilgrims in Wales, and at the same time hear his prayers in Drake Street, Red Lion Square, London? Or, supposing her to be in heaven, how she can attend to either the one or the other? If Mr. Andrews shall make this intelligible and credible, he will show himself to be as great a man as the unanswerable Dr. Milner himself.

For want of Popish authority on this subject, I take the following from THE PROTESTANT ADVOCATE, in the Anti-Jacobin Review, for April last. "1st, The saints know the prayers of men by the agency of angels, who are always passing backwards and forwards. 2d, The saints themselves are always passing backwards and forwards. 3d, The saints view all things in God from the moment of their beatitude. 4th, That this is not the case, but our prayers are then only revealed to them by God when they are made. The first two have lived their day, and although they once blinded the minds of the weak, they are now generally allowed to be nonsense. The third fast approaches the same fate; for the expression, *view all things in God*, begins to be regarded as words without meaning."—"Hence, the last, is the one at present depended upon."

My readers will agree with me that this is not a proper subject of levity; and yet it is difficult to treat it with becoming reverence. It is no doubt possible with God to communicate to the saints in heaven the prayers of their friends on earth; but it may be asked for what conceivable purpose? The grossest idolater will not say in plain words that the saints are upon a footing of equality with God, and that he must consult them whether it be proper to grant all or any of the petitions which he is supposed to communicate to them; or that he must suspend the granting of such petitions as he approves till the saints express their approbation. I know it is alledged that God grants the petitions that are addressed to the saints, and which he makes known to them, in consideration of the singular merits of the saints; but this only leads to other, and equally fatal errors: it is putting the merits of mere creatures in the place of Christ's righteousness; while, in point of fact, there is not a particle of merit to be found among all the saints in heaven. Their unceasing acknowledgment, in common with that of the saints on earth, is, 'not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Tit. iii. 5.

THE

Protestant,

No. XLVIII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 12th, 1819.

A WRITER in the Anti-Jacobin Review for April last, informs us, that "a native of India, lately in London, very much censured the want of images in our churches; he said, the worshippers had nothing upon which they could fix their attention, and hence they were often gazing at each other, and often at mere inanity. We, says he, have in our temples an image of the Deity to look at, with large eyes, huge ears, great hands, and long feet. Not that we believe this very image to be the Deity, but we use it only to fix our attention, and to remind us that the Being which it represents, can see every thing, hear every thing.' &c. I make use of this anecdote as an introduction to what I have to say on the subject of worshipping images, as practised in the Church of Rome.

There can be nothing more explicit than the divine command, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them." In my seventeenth Number, I convicted the Church of Rome of mutilating the ten commandments, by leaving out the whole of the second. To make up the number, they divided what we call the tenth into two; but this reduced them to a difficulty which required some cunning to get over. In the second edition of the commandments, in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, the arrangement of the tenth is different from that of Exodus xx. The one is, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house*, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *wife*; the other is, Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's *wife*, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's *house*. Thus, according to the Popish arrangement, what was the ninth commandment in the one passage, would be the tenth in the other. It required no less than the wisdom of the Council of Trent to remedy this evil, which they did by uniting the two; and thus it stands in the Douay Catechism to this day:—"The ninth and tenth commandments. Say the ninth and tenth. A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's

goods." From Deut. x. 4. we are sure that the words or commandments were ten. Nothing can appear more natural than the Protestant division of them; and it is evident that the Popish division cannot be the right one, seeing it requires them to blend what they call two into one.

"This inversion," says Mr. Cunninghame, "of the two first clauses of the tenth commandment, has, as will be seen afterwards, been providentially the means of detecting the fraud of the Romish Church, in blending the two first commandments together, for the purpose of subtracting the second, and then dividing the tenth into two, to make up the complete number. If, in the catechisms of that church, it had been usual to insert the commandments at full length, no end could have been served by blending together the first and second commandments, and the fraud would probably never have been attempted; but when it is known that it was customary only to insert, in the public formularies of instruction, the first sentence of each commandment, the reason will at once appear, for uniting the first precept of the decalogue with the second; for by this expedient, and by inserting only the first sentence of the two united commandments, the Romish Church has, in many of her catechisms, got rid of the commandment against image worship altogether, and effectually concealed the knowledge of its existence from the minds of the ignorant common people." *Apostacy of the Church of Rome*, p. 60. I wish Mr. Andrews, or some other Papist, would undertake to answer this book. Until something of the kind be done, I shall continue to believe that Papists themselves consider it unanswerable.

Mr. Cunninghame might have said that the divine commandments were thus mutilated, not in *many*, but in *all* the catechisms of the Romish Church, until they were shamed out of their villany by the light of the Reformation: and indeed he has said that this mutilated copy of the commandments, which he gives in pages 61, 62, was the only one to be found in the Manuals of the Romish Church, before the Reformation, and even at a later period; and he quotes Dr. Stillingfleet, as challenging a Papist, as lately as 1658, to tell him in what public office of their church the second commandment was to be found.

Indeed, when the priests had made up their minds to deceive the people, it was necessary that they should have recourse to fraud. It was not possible to reduce men and women altogether to the rank of brute beasts, though it was determined to rule them as such. The thinking and reasoning faculty was not quite extinct in the darkest ages. The priests could not inscribe on the wall behind the altar, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath," and then lay down upon the altar an image, or crucifix, to be worshipped. They could not insert the same words in any of their catechisms for the instruction of the people, and then exhort them to come and pay their devotions

before an image of the Virgin Mary. In short, it was quite necessary that they should give up the worship of images, or conceal the divine command which forbids it. They chose to do the latter; and thus, by suppressing a part of the divine law, they took upon themselves the condemnation of all those who, through ignorance, should be guilty of breaking it.

The priests, however, have not yet been entirely shamed out of this piece of fraud and imposition; for the second commandment is still omitted in such of their catechisms as are used in Ireland, and other unenlightened parts of Europe. They have restored it to its place in the catechism which is used in Glasgow, because they have not the face to conceal it, where every child might detect the imposture. See this subject more fully discussed in my seventeenth Number.

Image worship is not publicly practised by Papists in Glasgow, therefore they have restored the commandment to its place; but where the practice exists, the commandment is concealed. This is an unequivocal admission, on the part of the priests, that the practice and the commandment cannot stand together; and they have presumed to exercise the dispensing power, in its highest possible degree, by setting aside an entire precept of the law, which God himself pronounced upon mount Sinai, in the hearing of the whole congregation of Israel.

I proceed now to give the high authorities which sanction image worship in the Church of Rome; and I appeal to every reader, whether they do not, though there was nothing else against her, clearly convict that church of the grossest idolatry. The following constitution was established by Thomas Arundell, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his provincial council, held at Oxford, in the year 1408; and if Popery were restored in England, this would be found the law of the church there, as really as it was in the fifteenth century. I have the Latin original before me, but I will content myself with Archbishop Usher's translation:—"From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the cross and the image of the crucifix, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honour of them whom they figure, as also their places and relicts, ought to be worshipped with processions, bendings of the knee, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lighting of candles, and pilgrimages; together with all other manners and forms whatsoever, as hath been accustomed to be done in our, or our predecessors' times."

The following authority is higher than that of any one branch of the Romish Church. In the Roman catechism, authorised by the Council of Trent, the parish priest is required to instruct the people as follows:—"Not only that it is lawful to have images in the church, and to give honour and worship unto them, (forasmuch as the honour which is done unto them, is referred unto the things which they represent,) but also that this hath still been done to the great good of the faithful; and that

the images of saints are put in churches, as well that they *may be worshipped*, as that we, being admonished by their example, might conform ourselves to their life and manners."

With regard to the nature of the worship which is offered to images, we are taught that "it must not only be confessed that the faithful in the church do adore before the images, (as some peradventure would cautelously speak,) but also *adore the image itself*, without what scruple you will: yea, they do reverence it with the same worship wherewith they do the thing that is represented thereby. Wherefore, if that ought to be adored with *latria*, or divine worship, this also is to be adored with *latria*; if with *dulia* or *hyperdulia*, this likewise is to be adored with the same kind of worship. And so we see that St. Thomas Aquinas doth directly conclude, that the same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ, and Christ himself; and, by consequence, seeing Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, or divine worship, that his image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*." *Usher's Answer*, p. 497, 498. with the Latin originals, as quoted by him.

Let it be remembered that St. Thomas Aquinas is one of the highest authorities in the Church of Rome. He is called the Angelic Doctor, because, in his theological speculations, he rose above the rank of ordinary men, and was understood to approximate that of angels; and Pedro de Cabrero, a great divine in Spain, has declared that "the doctrine delivered by St. Thomas—that the image, and the sampler represented by it, are to be worshipped with the same act of adoration, is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith. This, he saith, is the doctrine, not only of St. Thomas, and of his disciples, but also of all the old schoolmen almost." *Ibid.* 499. It was then the doctrine of almost all these great divines that an image of Christ was to be worshipped with the same adoration as Christ himself; and as Papists were impious enough to make images of God the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, it follows, of course, that these images were all to be worshipped with the same degree of adoration, as that which was offered to the God and Father of all.

I could fill this sheet with the testimonies of other great divines, all to the same purpose; but that I may not rest on the authority of mere individuals, however great and renowned in the Church of Rome, I proceed to give the solemn authentic canon of the Council of Trent:—"Sess. 25th. That the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin Mother of God, and other saints, are to be kept and reserved, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them; not for that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was anciently done by the heathens, who put their trust in idols, but because the honour which is exhibited to images, is referred to the prototype, or

thing represented by them : so that by the image which we kiss, and before which we kneel, or put off our hats, we adore Christ, and reverence his saints, whom the said images represent."

Such is the solemn decision and authentic canon of the last general council that was held in the Romish church. To the decrees of this council every Popish priest is bound by solemn oath to conform in every respect; and if it were not that a certain priest does not keep his oath, "the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin-mother of God, and other saints," would be set up and worshipped, even in our own city, so truly Presbyterian, and so distinguished for its opposition to the abominations of Rome, ever since it received the light of the Reformation. Justice, however, requires me to say, that the Pope has the power of dispensing with such oaths as cannot be conveniently kept; and, therefore, the priest above referred to, may have received a dispensation, freeing him from the obligation of setting up images in his church, until he shall have brought our good citizens to a more exact conformity with Rome.

The grave council enacts it as a law of the church, that "due honour and veneration is to be given to them," (i. e. the images.) Now those who are acquainted with human nature, especially those who have studied the human character as it appears in a state of gross ignorance, know, that the due honour and veneration here enjoined to be paid to images, will be the highest veneration and honour of which they are capable; that, in short, all the worship which they have to give, will be given to the images which the church has set up. To say that no divinity or virtue is in the image, or that nothing is to be asked of it, is saying no more than the heathen would say of their images. They did not regard the block of wood or stone as God, any more than the Papists do. The Hindoo mentioned at the beginning of the present Number, did not regard the great image as the deity, but only as reminding him of the deity; and I suppose there are few Papists so extremely stupid as to mistake a block of wood, or a piece of stucco, for the real Virgin Mary, though they are guilty of equal stupidity in believing a piece of bread to be really their Saviour. When, therefore, they give due honour to an image, as representing Christ or the Virgin Mary, they are guilty of the very same idolatry as the Pagans were, who honoured the images of their gods, on account of that which they represented.

In short, Papists cannot use a word in defence of their image worship, which was not used by the heathens before them. The heathen declared that the worship of their images was merely relative; and that it had respect to the being whom the image represented. For instance, they worshipped, in one place, Jupiter Capitolinus; in another, Jupiter Olympius; and they understood these to be merely different representations of the same god, not that the image itself was the god. They never could imagine that the sculptor made the god who made himself. This ab-

surdity was left for the darker ages of counterfeit Christianity; but they supposed the divinity used the image as an occasional place of abode, and they invoked it as residing there. In short, the image worship of the Romanists is as idolatrous as the calf-worship of the Israelites, and the worship of Venus by Horace and the old Romans. See *Antijacobin Review for April last*, p. 71.

In Deut. iv. 15, 16. we read as follows: "Take good heed to yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude in the day that God spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female." Here the making of any figure as a representation of the God that spoke to them, is declared to be a corrupting of themselves; and a reason is given, namely, that God did not appear to them under any similitude. When he spoke to them out of the midst of the fire, they saw no resemblance of any thing in heaven, or in the earth, or in the sea. Any figure, therefore, which they could make, would be a creature of their own fancy, and, according to their gross and carnal conceptions, would have been dishonouring to that God who is a Spirit, invisible, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. To attempt to make an image, or any resemblance, of the eternal and invisible God, indicates a state of mind the most grossly estranged from the knowledge of the true God; yet this state of mind actually exists among our Glasgow Papists; and it is avowed by AMICUS VERITATIS, who speaks of the material building called the Catholic Chapel, as resembling the majesty of that God to whose service it is dedicated. He means this to be understood of the true God; but it is evident he was thinking of an idol, and of a material one too, seeing it could find a resemblance in timber and stone, cut into figures as ridiculous as any which our Pagan ancestors worshipped in the valleys or upon the mountains.

The image by which Papists would represent God the Father, is that of an old man, to denote wisdom and eternity; * though to represent eternity by the utmost period of mortal life, is a thousand times more absurd than to represent the ocean by a drop of water; and as for the greatest wisdom of the aged among men, it is as far from that of God, as a few years are from eternity. The image of Christ is usually that of a human body extended upon a cross: and they represent the Holy Spirit under the

* "That church," says Mr. Cunninghame, page 71. "is chargeable with the toleration of images even of the first person of the Godhead, the Eternal Father. I myself saw a picture of this kind in one of the churches of Antwerp, about twenty-five years ago; and the existence of such abominations is acknowledged in an Abridgement of Sacred History by L'Abbé Fleury, which is in my possession. 'The images,' says he, 'which represent the divine persons are drawn from the sacred Scriptures. God has sometimes appeared to his prophets under the form of a venerable old man, to signify his eternity.'" Mr. C. justly remarks on the words printed in *italics*, "This is one of those instances of daring falsehood, whereby the Romish church deceives the people."

image of a dove, from a mistaken apprehension, I suppose, of the meaning of those passages in the gospel history which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus Christ. It is said, John i. 32. "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." God was pleased to point out the Saviour to John the Baptist, by a sign from heaven. This sign was the descent of the Holy Ghost, in a bodily or visible form, as in Luke iii. 22. But we are not told what that form was. It descended like a dove, that is, as a dove descends, slowly hovering over the object on which it is about to alight. If to represent the Holy Ghost under the figure of a dove be a Popish error, candour requires me to admit, that it is one in which they have been followed by most of those Protestants who carnalize the Bible by the unnecessary accompaniment of pictures.

It is evident that Jesus Christ never intended that his people should have any picture, or visible representation, even of his human body, for no means were used either by himself or by his disciples to preserve the likeness; much less could it be his intention that they should have a visible representation of the divine nature, as subsisting in Father, Son, or Holy Spirit; yet Papists have gone to such a length in impiety as to make an image of the Trinity, in the form of a man with three faces.

It would appear that the Church of Rome cannot put her hand to any religious matter without corrupting it. Though they have given the second commandment in the Douay Catechism, blending it with the first, yet they have mistranslated one phrase in it, so as to conceal the prohibition of their practice of prostration before images. Their translation is, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them," which ought strictly to be rendered, "Thou shalt not *bow thyself* to them, and shalt not serve them." The commandment, as given in the Douay Catechism, therefore, does not prohibit the kneeling before images, or any other mark of worship, provided it be not *adoration*, or worship, in the highest sense. One of their questions on the commandment is as follows:—"Is it lawful to honour the images of Christ and his saints? A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them, is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images, or crosses, which we *kiss*, and before which we *kneel*, we honour and adore Christ himself." This is precisely such an answer as an ancient Roman would have given, had he been interrogated as to his worshipping the image of Jupiter.

Now we shall see that the words *bowing* and *kissing* are the very terms used in Scripture to denote divine worship: and the giving of which to any creature or image is declared to be idolatry. In the 72d Psalm, the worship which shall be paid to Messiah himself is expressed by the words,—"*They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him;*" and, in the 95th Psalm, it is said, "*Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker.*" "In both these

passages, bowing before, and kneeling before God and Christ, are expressive of the worship paid to them. In like manner," continues Mr. Cunninghame, p. 70. "the worship to be paid to the Son of God, by the kings of the earth, is expressed in Psalm ii. 12. by the words "Kiss the Son;" and the seven thousand in Israel, who had not been partakers of the sin of idolatry, are designated as *all the knees who had not bowed to Baal, and the mouths which had not kissed him*. But this very worship, so far as the external acts are concerned, the Papists pay to the images of saints. Therefore they do thereby grossly and palpably violate the commandment which forbids the worship of images."

The strong language of Job (chap. xxxi. 26—28.) is decisive on this point. If he had looked upon the sun or the moon, and merely kissed his own hand, in token of respect, he says this would have been denying the God that is above. In Hosea xiii. 2. to kiss the calves, the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, is represented as the most heinous idolatry; and yet Papists are taught by the Douay Catechism to kiss and bow down before images of wood and stone. I have been told that the great toe of the image of Peter in Rome has been actually kissed away, by devout citizens and strangers, in the course of ages. It would require some skill in calculation to say how many kisses would consume two or three inches of marble or bronze.

I shall conclude this Number with the prayer used in the consecration of images, as it is found in the *Rituale Romanum*, authorised by Pope Urban VIII. "Grant, O God, that whosoever before this image, shall diligently and humbly, upon his knees, worship and honour thy only begotten Son, or the blessed Virgin (according as the image is that is consecrating) or this glorious Apostle, or Martyr, or Confessor, or Virgin, that he may obtain, by his or her merits, and intercession, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter." "Now," says Mr. Cunninghame, from whom I quote, "if this be not gross idolatry let the Church of Rome show wherein the worship of Jupiter and Apollo was idolatry."

I expect to finish, in my next Number, this subject, and that of worshipping relics. My fiftieth Number will conclude the first volume of THE PROTESTANT, when an Index will be given. I intend, in that Number, to insert the declarations of three credible witnesses, which completely prove the story which Mr. Andrews has so often called a forgery. These declarations were taken down by a Notary Public, and are offered to be verified by oath. Two Papists were present during part of the examination of my first witness; and they were invited to wait and hear the whole, and cross-examine them all, which, however, they did not do.

Protestant,

No. XLIX.

 SATURDAY, JUNE 19th, 1819.

I BELIEVE it is generally supposed, that the children of Israel took the idea of making and worshipping the image of a calf, from the Egyptian Apis; but it is not so generally understood, that Apis was probably no more than the image which the Egyptians made, and afterwards worshipped, in honour of Joseph, their great preserver. I learn from Pere Lamy, who, upon the authority of Jewish Antiquities, gives the banners, or standards of the twelve tribes, that that of Ephraim as constituted the head of the house of Joseph, was the figure of an ox. Perhaps it is in allusion to this banner of the tribe, exhibited in the midst of the congregation, that Moses says concerning Joseph, Deut. xxxiii. 17. "His glory is like the firstlings of his bullock," &c. denoting the strength and vivacity of that tribe.

Considering the general prevalence of idolatry, it was not to be wondered at that the Egyptians should give divine honours to Joseph after his death; and Julius Firmicus tells us expressly that they did so. "The Egyptians," says he, "after his death, according to the appointment of their country, built temples to him. And again, this man is worshipped in Egypt, he is adored, &c." St. Augustine, or whoever else was the author of that book which bears his name, *De Mirabilibus Scripturæ*, was of the same opinion, as also Ruffinus. *l. 2. Hist. Eccles. c. 23.* They say that the Egyptians "set up the symbol of an ox over the sepulchre of Joseph, in memory of their deliverance;" and these writers, together with Suidas, add, that "his statue was set up with a bushel upon his head, to denote the plenty of corn which he provided for them." See *Discourse concerning Idolatry*, anon. p. 28.

To this let me add, as a conjecture of my own, that the idea of representing Joseph under the figure of an ox, might have been taken from the fat and lean kine which were the subjects of Pharaoh's dream, the interpretation of which suggested the measures which were taken for the preservation of the whole nation.

Be this as it may, if there be any truth in the opinion expressed by the above writers, it accounts for the readiness with which the children of Israel fell into the sin of worshipping the calf or young bullock. Joseph had been the preserver of their nation as well as of the Egyptians; and such was the grossness of their conceptions, that they expected, perhaps, that he would preserve them again, when they thought Moses had left them; or perhaps they looked for deliverance from God through the intercession of Joseph, for they had not altogether disowned the true God, any more than Papists do when they worship images. They called the feast of the calf, a feast to the Lord; and they might consider him as somehow dwelling in the image of their great patriarch, who, as a Papist would say, had such great merit before God, that he could procure from him what he pleased; for they said, "These be thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." It is worthy of remark too, that Jeroboam, who set up the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, was descended from Joseph by Ephraim, which may account for his preference of this idol.

From the time that Jeroboam set up these calves, the ten tribes, to use a vulgar expression, had not a day to do well. Every thing went wrong with them. They were made to suffer all the calamities of war and famine, and every species of misery that can affect the human race, in the present life. This was because they had set up idols, a crime of which God had declared his abhorrence, and against which he had pronounced the heaviest judgments.

What was declared to be so great a crime under the Old Testament, cannot be considered less, but rather more heinous under the New Testament. To make an image of the Virgin Mary, or any saint, and set it up even as a representation of some object of worship, cannot be less offensive to the true God now than the making the golden calves, or the image of Baal was in former times. Throughout the Old Testament history we find that God never forgot, and never ceased to remind the people, of the sin of Jeroboam, wherewith he made Israel to sin; and can we suppose that he overlooks the gross idolatries of the Church of Rome? He does not send Prophets to reprove them as he did to Jeroboam; but he has given the complete volume of his word, which declares his abhorrence of idolatry, and that it shall not go unpunished. Neither does he, in such a visible and sensible manner, connect the punishment with the sin, as he did in the case of Israel; but the punishment is not on that account the less certain; and it will be so much the more dreadful that it has been long delayed.

Deceit and falsehood are necessary accompaniments of image-worship. The system is founded on lies, and supported by all de-ceivableness of unrighteousness. This has impressed a character

upon the general body, which appears in almost every thing that they say and write on the subject of their religion and worship. Nay, some of their great casuists have declared a lie to be no sin, or only what they call a venial one, if it be to promote the glory of God, or one's own advantage. This system of falsehood and deceit appears in nothing more than in the lying wonders which they relate concerning their images. Every one knows what foolish stories are related of the miraculous house of Loretta, and of the miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, which is the idol of the place. Middleton tells us "that in the high street of Loretta which leads to the holy house, the shops are filled with beads, crucifixes, Agnus Deis, and all the trinkets of Popish manufacture; where I observed printed certificates, or testimonials, affixed to each shop, declaring all their toys to have been touched by the blessed image: which certificates are provided for no other purpose, but to humour the general persuasion, both of the buyer and the seller, that some virtue is communicated by that touch, from a power residing in the image." "For what else," says he, "can we say of those miraculous images, as they are called in every great town of Italy, but that some divinity and power is universally believed to reside in them? Are not all their people persuaded, and do not all their books testify, that these images have sometimes moved themselves from one place to another; have wept, talked, and wrought many miracles; and does not this necessarily imply an extraordinary power residing in them?" *Preface, page xxvii.*

"In one of the churches of Lucca, they show an image of the Virgin, with the child Jesus in her arms, of which they relate this story. That a blaspheming gamester, in a rage of despair, took up a stone and threw it at the infant; but the Virgin, to preserve him from the blow which was levelled at his head, shifted him instantly from her right arm into the left, in which he is now held; while the blasphemer was swallowed up by the earth upon the spot, where the hole, which they declare to be unfathomable, is still kept open, and inclosed only with a grate, just before the altar of the image. The Virgin, however, received the blow upon her shoulder, whence the blood presently issued, which is preserved in a chrystal, and produced with the greatest ceremony, by the priest in his vestments, with tapers lighted, while all the company kiss the sacred relic on their knees." *Wright's travels at Lucca, quoted by Middleton, pref. xxviii:* on which the Doctor justly remarks. "Now, does not the attestation of this miracle naturally tend to persuade people, that there is an actual power residing in the image, which can defend itself from injuries, and inflict vengeance on all who dare to insult it?"

St. Dominic, it is well known, was the founder of the Inquisition; and he has been, of course, a great favourite with the high

authorities in the Romish church. "One of the most celebrated images in Italy," says Dr. Middleton, "is that of St. Dominic, of Surriano in Calabria, which, as their histories testify, was brought down from heaven about two centuries ago, by the Virgin Mary in person, accompanied by Mary Magdalene and St. Catherine. Before this glorious picture, as they affirm, great numbers of the dead have been restored to life, and hundreds from the agonies of death; the dumb, the blind, the deaf, the lame, have been cured, and all sorts of diseases and mortal wounds have been healed: all which facts are attested by public notaries; and confirmed by the relations of Cardinals, Prelates, Generals, and Priors of that order; and the certainty of them so generally believed, that from the 9th of July to the 9th of August, the anniversary festival of the saint, they have always counted above a hundred thousand pilgrims, and many of them of the highest quality, who come from different parts of Europe, to pay their devotions, and make their offerings at this picture." *La vie St. Dominic*, p. 599, 4to. a Paris, 1647, as quoted by Middleton.

Aringhus, touching upon the subject, in his elaborate account of subterraneous Rome, observes, 'that the images of the blessed Virgin shine out continually by new and daily miracles, to the comfort of their votaries, and the confusion of all gainsayers. Within these few years, says he, under every Pope, successively, some or other of our sacred images, especially of the more ancient, have made themselves illustrious, and acquired a peculiar worship and veneration by the exhibition of fresh signs; as it is notorious to all who dwell in this city. But how can I pass over in silence the image of St. Dominic; so conspicuous at this day for its never ceasing miracles; which attract the resort and admiration of the whole Christian world. This picture, which as pious tradition informs us, was brought down from heaven, about the year of our redemption, 1530, is a most solid bulwark of the Church of Christ, and a noble monument of the pure faith of Christians, against all the *impious opposers of image worship*. The venerable image is drawn indeed but rudely, without the help of art or pencil; sketched out by a celestial hand; with a book in its right and a lily in its left hand; of a moderate stature, but of a grave and comely aspect; with a robe reaching down to the heels. Those who have written its history, assert, that the painters, in their attempts to copy it, have not always been able to take similar copies: because it frequently assumes a different air, and rays of light have been seen by some to issue from its countenance; and it has more than once removed itself from one place to another. *The worship*, therefore, of this picture is become so famous through all christendom, that multitudes of people, to the number of a hundred thousand and upwards, flock annually to pay their devotions to it, on the festival of the saint: and though it be

strange, which I have now related, yet what I am going to say is still stranger, that not only the original picture, made not by human but by heavenly hands, is celebrated by its daily miracles, but even the copy of it, which is piously preserved in this city, in the monastery called St. Mary's, above the Minerva, is famous also, in these our days, for its perpetual signs and wonders, as the numberless votive offerings hanging around it, and the bracelets and jewels which adorn it, testify." *Mid. pref. p. xxxi. &c.*

If Papists are pleased to believe all this, I cannot help it; but I hope few arguments are necessary to convince every Protestant reader that the whole story is made up of lies and imposition. It is a curious fact, that those who are trained to lying, as Papists are, are the most inclined to believe lies, which is accounted for from their being given up to strong delusion. No doubt, then, they believe very firmly all that their priest tell them about these miraculous images, and that miraculous picture, which, though they say it was made in heaven, is yet such a dæmon that no artist on earth would own with it. The circumstance, however, of hundreds of thousands of pilgrims coming to it, accounts for its popularity. It is a gainful imposture, and therefore the priests use all their art, and forge many fine stories to keep up the credit of it.

The worship thus paid to the image of St. Dominic, is, I think, one of the worst features in the character of modern Rome. The characters of men may be known from the object of their worship, or from the qualities which are supposed to reside in that object. Thus the worshippers of Bacchus and Venus were notorious for all manner of licentiousness; the worshippers of Moloch caused their children to pass through the fire in honour of their idol. Dominic was the Moloch of the Church of Rome; and the adorations paid to him at this day, show the bloody intolerant character of modern Papists; that, in fact, they are what they have always been, whenever they have the opportunity of exhibiting their true character.

Dominic was appointed the first Inquisitor, by Alexander III. the bloodiest of all the Popes. I give the following account of him from Limborch, who quotes from Popish writers as his authorities, as indeed he generally does. Then Dominic had received the Pope's letters, appointing him to the holy office of Inquisitor, "Upon a certain day, in the midst of a great concourse of people, he declared openly, in his sermon, in the church of St. Prullian, that he was raised to a new office by the Pope; adding, that he was resolved to defend, with his utmost vigour, the doctrines of the faith; and that if the spiritual and ecclesiastical arms were not sufficient for this end, 'twas his fixed purpose to call in the assistance of the secular, to excite and compel the Catholic princes to take arms against heretics, that the very memory

of them might be entirely destroyed." The history of the thirteenth century shows how horribly faithful he was to his promise. That he was a bloody and a cruel man, is confessed by writers of his own order; thus, for instance, Camillus Campegius, a Dominican, and also an Inquisitor, having recited certain letters of his founder, says, "I have the more willingly annexed to this treatise of punishments, these letters of St. Dominic, our father, who first exercised the office of Inquisitor, that all may be able to make a comparison between the *ancient severity* made use of to stop the progress of these crimes, and the present *moderation* and *tenderness* of this holy tribunal." What must the Inquisition, in the thirteenth century, have been, when that of the sixteenth was declared to be, in comparison of it, moderation and tenderness! St. Dominic's "mother, before she conceived him, is said to have dreamed, that she was with child of a whelp, carrying in his mouth a lighted torch; and that after he was born, he put the world in an uproar by his fierce barkings, and set it on fire by the torch which he carried in his mouth. His followers interpret this dream of his doctrine, by which he enlightened the world; whereas others, if dreams presage any thing, think that the torch was an emblem of that fire and faggot, by which an infinite number of men were burnt to ashes" *Limb. Hist. Inq. cap. X.* The standard of the Inquisition at Goa, has, under a portrait of the saint, this figure of a dog, with a torch in his mouth, setting fire to a figure of the globe.

Now the devotions which Papists pay to the image, and to the memory of such a man, make it evident that his character and conduct are not only approved, but applauded by them. What, therefore, are we to expect from Papists any where, but the imitation of his conduct, whenever providential restraints are removed? The late atrocities in the south of France, and during the Irish rebellion, are no more than what might naturally be expected of persons who worship such a fiend as St. Dominic. The great business of his life was extirpation. His favourite employment was to persuade and compel princes to tread under foot, and destroy heretics, as venomous adders, who ought not to be suffered to live on the earth; and he was much more of an honest man than modern Papists, for he did not affect to conceal, but openly avowed what his object was; whereas his followers, of the present day, insidiously conceal and deny what their own principles would necessarily lead them to, if they had the secular power in their hands. Their venomous hatred of heretics is not the least abated; and it would be childish to expect that where such a principle exists, it would not show itself by actual violence, whenever it could do so with impunity.

I have been led away a little from the subject of image worship, but these reflections will be found not unconnected with

it ; for it may be received as a general principle, that according to the representation of an object of worship, in the mind of a worshipper, such will be the character of the worshipper himself. It is no objection to this general principle, that some of the objects of Popish worship were really saints,—holy men and women ; for it is not their character of gospel holiness that has a representation in their minds, or that is the foundation of their worship. It is not, for instance, Peter as a zealous and affectionate preacher of the gospel of the grace of God, but Peter, the Prince of Apostles, and the first of the Popes, whose image they worship in Rome. It is not Mary, the humble follower of Jesus, but an idol, who, they suppose, can protect them from evil, and who will connive at their crimes, that they worship under the title of the blessed Virgin : but when they worship such a one as St. Dominic, they do it under his true character, of which there is a resemblance in themselves.

I hope it will appear, from what I have said on this subject, that the Church of Rome is convicted of the gross idolatry of image-worship. It was my intention to have followed up this immediately with an account of their doctrine concerning relics, and the worship which is given to them ; but I must leave this till the commencement of my second volume, as the next, which is intended to be the concluding Number of the present volume, will be taken up with some curious private matter relating to the conduct of our Papists at home. I shall fill up the remainder of the present sheet with an account of the mode of imposition practised in our own country, in former times, in order to support the credit of an image, and how an imposture was detected. I am indebted for it to Scott's History of the Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland : Life of John Row.

“ About the year 1549, a poor friendless boy, of whose birth probably his parents had been ashamed, tended the sheep belonging to the nuns of Scienna, or Sciennes, about a quarter of a mile south from Edinburgh. It was one of his childish amusements to turn up the white of his eyes, and, in doing it, he succeeded so well, as to be able, at his pleasure, to make himself appear perfectly blind. The nuns observed him in his amusement, and spoke of it to some priests and friars who were their visitors. It immediately occurred to them, that if proper care was taken of this young person, he might, in course of time, become the fit subject of a miracle.

“ The innocent child was secreted from public view, it has been said, seven or eight years, and mostly in one of the cells, or some retired apartment in the convent. At the end of that number of years, his stature and features were so much altered, as that he could not easily be recollected by the very few persons who formerly had known him. He was now judged to be of a proper age to be sent forth as a blind mendicant, and to receive

instructions how he should behave. A person was hired to conduct him, who believed him to have been born blind, and to have been hitherto supported chiefly by charitable contributions from the ladies of Sienna.

“ The simple young man, who scarcely knew any other people in the world than those under whose tuition he had been held, readily promised to obey their injunctions. They bound him by a solemn, but rash vow, to affect blindness, and to beg alms, till they should advertise him to the contrary. He kept his promise, and, for a considerable space of time, was led through the country, receiving such alms as benevolent people were pleased to give him.

“ At last the period arrived when those priests and friars who were in the secret of his not being really blind, thought it expedient that he should be relieved from his hard condition.”—

“ At the east end of the village of Musselburgh, in Mid-Lothian, was a celebrated chapel, dedicated to the honour of the Virgin Mary. Its proper name was Loretta, but it was vulgarly called Alareit, or Lawreit. There was also a chapel of the same name in Perth; and many credulous people in the Lothians, and at Perth, as well as the people of Loretta, in Italy, believed that their chapel contained within it the identical small brick built house in which the blessed Mother of our Lord had dwelt when at Nazareth; and that it had been miraculously conveyed and upheld entire, from its original seat, by the ministry of angels.”—

It was in the well frequented chapel at Musselburgh, “ and where miracles were most commonly expected to be seen, that the pupil of the nuns was to receive his sight. Public intimation, of the miracle to be performed, was given in Edinburgh, and in the neighbouring parts, and on the day appointed, a prodigious number of people were assembled. They found that there was a stage erected on the outside of the chapel. Having waited a little while, they beheld, led forward upon this stage, the seemingly blind young man, whom many of them knew, and whose blindness they had probably often pitied. He was by priests and friars, and, no doubt, also by Thomas, the Hermit, (a famous worker of miracles,) if he was then alive. After some time spent in the use of prayers and ceremonies, his eyes, to the satisfaction of the multitude, appeared to be perfectly restored. The young man, who had long been restricted from employing honest means for his subsistence, now sincerely rejoiced. He returned thanks to the priests and friars; and when he came down from the stage, was carressed and congratulated by the people, and some of whom gave him money.

A Protestant gentleman who was present, detected the cheat, and took the young man into his service.

THE
Protestant,

No. L

SATURDAY, JUNE 26th, 1819.

ON the 2d of June, I was waited upon by two gentlemen of the Romish Church, and one Protestant, "in pursuance," as was stated in a card from one of them, "of the requisition contained in the 24th Number of *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*." Relating to the story of the man in the Wynd, I had said, in my 42d Number, "If any of my readers, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." Mr. Andrews quotes these words, partly in great capitals, to show his admiration of my boldness; and he adds, "Well, then, I have no doubt but *THE PROTESTANT* has many readers, both Popish and Protestant, who doubt his tale, I most earnestly request that some of them will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that satisfactory evidence which he has pledged himself to furnish them with."

The hour having been fixed the day before, I had three women in waiting when the gentlemen called, ready to give their evidence upon oath, and a Notary Public to take it down. To my surprise, however, I found they did not want the evidence of witnesses, but that they came on purpose to examine me: and they presented me a string of questions, most of which, so far as I recollect, I could have answered; but I declined submitting to be interrogated, while I did not see what end it could serve, or to what discussions it might lead. I had a friend or two present, who, as well as myself, endeavoured to convince them of the absurdity of their demand. They professed the utmost respect for my character as a gentleman, and declared their willingness to receive *my* testimony, but as for my witnesses they would not believe *them*. Mr. Simeon, who appeared to be the principal person of the party, made some unhandsome and cruel

insinuations against the character of my witnesses, of which I shall say more hereafter; and positively declined hearing their evidence, but insisted on receiving from me answers to their written interrogatories. This appeared one of the most marvellous things I had ever seen. I had been repeatedly, and by hand-bills posted on the corners of the streets, accused of forgery, and of fabricating a certain story. I had publicly pledged myself to prove, by sufficient evidence, that the story was true. The gentlemen came to me on purpose to receive this evidence, or they did not come for the purpose of receiving what I had promised to furnish, and what they themselves professed to seek; but they would take no evidence but my *own word*, while my own veracity was the very point in question. The Protestant gentleman who came along with them was a stranger to me, but I learned that he was a respectable lawyer, who fills a civil office under the Sheriff. This rendered the procedure more surprising, as he could not but know what ought to be received as evidence, and what not. I intend, however, no reflection against him. He managed the business with the utmost politeness, and with as much liberality as was consistent with the part he had to perform; and I am persuaded he was not acquainted with the real state of the case. Had he known that the only point to be proved was, that, in a certain matter referred to, I had stated the truth, he would not have supposed that my bare word would be considered evidence; because, if persons would not believe what I had written, how could they believe what I should say?

Finding that they persisted in demanding of me answers to their questions, I protested before the whole company, in which were only two friends of my own, besides the Notary and his clerk, that I was ready to do all that I had promised to do; that is, that I would prove, by these three witnesses, that the story which Mr. Andrews called a forgery, was true in every material point; and I told the gentlemen who came to receive the evidence which I had promised to furnish, that I would proceed in taking the declarations of my witnesses: that I would be glad if they would stay, and hear, and cross-examine them; but that if they would not *hear*, they might *read*, as I would publish the whole matter.

They then consented to hear what the witnesses had to say, but they would have no hand in examining them, or so much as allow their names to be taken down, as present at, or parties concerned in the examination. It was not convenient at the time and place to get a Justice of the Peace, but supposing the professional gentleman who came as the legal adviser of the other two, from the office he holds, to be qualified to administer an oath, I requested him to swear the first witness, which he declined. She was therefore admonished to speak, as upon oath,

as she would probably be required to repeat her declaration, and swear before a Magistrate.

At Glasgow, the second day of June, Eighteen Hundred and Nineteen years, compeared the following persons, and freely and voluntarily emitted the following declarations, viz:—

Margaret King, *alias* M'Murray, wife of the deceased John M'Murray, late labourer in Glasgow, a Protestant,—Declares, That she was married about thirteen years ago, to the said John M'Murray, who was a Catholic, by one of the Justices of the Peace of Glasgow, whom she supposes to be a Mr. Menzies; but she is possessed of a certificate to that effect, which she can produce: That her husband and she lived in the utmost friendship, except upon the point of religion, and that her husband continued for many years before his death urging her to become a Catholic, which she always declined: That her said husband has repeatedly threatened her with death and destruction, and sworn by the Holy Trinity that he would do so unless she became Catholic; and for the same purpose upon one occasion offered her money, which she resisted and refused: That her said husband left her for the purpose of going to Ireland, as he said, about three weeks before his death, although he continued to lurk in Glasgow: That he sent for her the day before he died, at the foot of the Saltmarket, in a friend's house, who kept lodgings, but the name of the person she does not know, but that he is a Catholic, and a brother-in-law of Patrick Thornton, a member of the Roman Catholic Chapel in Glasgow; from which house she had her husband removed to the house of Elizabeth King, a cousin of the declarant's: That when her said husband was so removed as aforesaid, to her cousin's house, he declared his sorrow for having deserted her, but that it was by the advice of his priest, who had advised him, as he said he could not live with a woman with whom he could not associate on account of her religion, and being a heretic: That, when her husband died in the declarant's cousin's house, he was removed to her own house; and that after his death, the Letter quoted in the twenty-fifth Number of the Protestant, for January the second, 1819, was found in his pocket, and that it is fairly quoted in the said Number of the Protestant: That the said Letter is not wrote by her husband, as he could not write, but that she believes it was written by some person for him, at his request, and that it contains what she believes to be the real sentiments of her said husband at the time it was written, as it contains the sentiments she had repeatedly heard him utter in her presence: That her said husband was buried in the High Church-yard at the public expense. That, previous to her husband's death, she never knew who the author of THE PROTESTANT was, or that such a work ever existed. That she believes

her husband knew nothing of the author of that work: That, to her knowledge, there was no person of the Protestant religion in attendance upon her husband on his death-bed, who could forge the letter above-mentioned without her knowledge: That the said letter was found in her husband's coat pocket, in the Catholic lodging house above-mentioned, and that it was the coat he usually went to church with, and that he was not in the daily habit of wearing: That when the said letter was found as aforesaid, the following persons were present, viz. Elizabeth King, her cousin before-mentioned, and Mary Watson, tambourer in Glasgow, now residing in Greenock. Six words scored and one interlined before signing, and all this she declares to be truth, and that she cannot write; and that she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

" Mary M'Millan, wife of Archibald M'Donald, residing in Glasgow, who being examined, declares, That she knew the deceased John M'Murray referred to in the preceding declaration, as well as his wife, also before-mentioned: That the said John M'Murray and his said wife, lived together as married persons, in the declarant's immediate neighbourhood, for the space of twelve years; and that the said Margaret King lived in her neighbourhood as aforesaid, as the reputed wife of the said John M'Murray, although he was absent for some years: That she knows that the said John M'Murray, when at home, repeatedly maltreated and abused his said wife, on account of her religion, and used threats against her to make her become a Catholic, and said that her kind would all go to hell. And all this she declares to be truth, and that she cannot write, and she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

" Elizabeth King, tambourer in Glasgow, cousin of the first declarant, declares, That John M'Murray mentioned in the preceding declarations, died in her house, and that she was present in the Catholic lodging house, when the letter mentioned in the twenty-fifth Number of the Protestant was found in his pocket, when she went to get his clothes, and that the said letter is correctly copied into the said 25th Number of the Protestant, which she has now read over and compared with the original letter now shown to her. And all this is truth, and declares she cannot write.

" Compared the preceding witness, Elizabeth King, who being further interrogated, declares, That John M'Murray before-mentioned, was in the declarant's house with his wife the day before he died, when the declarant heard him beg pardon of his wife, for his cruel conduct towards her in deserting her, but that he laid the entire blame upon his priest. Farther declares, That the said John M'Murray and Margaret King, were publicly known to reside together as married persons, and that she has

known them for about thirteen years, during which time she always considered them to be man and wife, although the said John M'Murray was at one time absent from his wife for some years; and farther declares, That she has seen, what she was told to be, a certificate of the said John M'Murray and spouse's marriage, which was in the possession of the latter, and which she once heard read over, but does not recollect who it was signed by. Farther declares, That she heard the said John M'Murray, on the morning of the day on which he died, and in bed, again ask pardon of his wife for his conduct towards her, and that she then, sitting by the bed-side weeping, freely forgave him, and wished that her Saviour might also forgive him; and, that after this happened, M'Murray died in the course of a few hours. (One word interlined.) And all this she declares to be the truth, and that she will attest what she has declared upon oath, if required."

When the first witness had proceeded about half way in her declaration, the three gentlemen remarked that her examination was likely to occupy a long time, and that as it was not necessary that they should hear it all, they would withdraw. They requested, however, a meeting in the evening that they might hear what the two others had to say, which was agreed to, and they went away. Margaret King's declaration did indeed occupy a long time; and detailed many particulars of her husband's conduct towards her, on account of her heresy, and the hand which he said the priest had in it, but not bearing directly upon the point which I had to establish, they were not taken down. The whole story would occupy a large space in THE PROTESTANT; and she told it with such an appearance of sincerity, as left not a doubt of its truth in the mind of any gentleman who heard it to the end. The following certificate of her character, which is in my possession, is subscribed by a gentleman well known in this city, and whose word will go as far as that of any man in it. It is in the form of a letter addressed to myself. "Sir, I have known the bearer, Margaret King, about four years, and have every reason to believe, that she is an upright, simple Christian, and would abide by the truth. I remain, &c. June 4th, 1819." I have other certificates of the good character of my other witnesses, such as will convince any impartial person that their testimony would be received in any court in the kingdom; but, from motives of delicacy, I do not choose to thrust forward upon the public, the names of respectable individuals, in a controversy in which they have no personal interest, which might involve them in some degree of trouble, and expose them to a portion of that hatred with which our Papists regard THE PROTESTANT. Those who were willing to take my own word as a proof of my own veracity, will not perhaps believe that I have such certificates. I will not promise to satisfy such per-

sons, but I am ready to satisfy every body else. I do not know that my visitors had any specific objection to the two other witnesses, except that they took them, I suppose, for Protestants; and Margaret King having maintained for years a good character among her neighbours, I would not have thought of procuring any other evidence on her behalf, had not Mr. Simeon attempted to traduce her character. Thus, it seems, Papists are doomed to the fatality of contributing by every step they take to their own exposure, and the confirmation of my statements. The gentleman who certifies the character of Margaret King, assures me that he was well acquainted with her and her late husband; that he was often in their house within the last four years; that he endeavoured to persuade M^cMurray to allow his wife the exercise of her religion, and that he was equally urgent in exhorting her not to hinder him in the exercise of his. He authorises me to say farther, that M^cMurray frankly confessed to him one day, that Margaret was a much better wife since she became religious. From his conduct, however, it did not appear that he liked her the better for her religion. Every Christian knows that true religion makes the best husbands and the best wives; and since it is proved that she has behaved as a Christian since she gave evidence of being one, though our Papists could prove that she was not so good a wife before, it would not invalidate her present testimony.

The two last declarations were taken down immediately after the first, because it was found the women could not conveniently return in the evening. When the gentlemen called at the hour appointed, they were informed of this, and another meeting promised, if they wished to cross-examine them. The declarations were exhibited, which they looked at, but they expressed no desire to see or cross-examine the witnesses.

Now, I leave it to every impartial reader to say whether my case is not fully made out; that is, whether I have not proved the truth of my story in every material point. The man used every means in his power to persuade his wife to become Papist. Because she would not comply, he left her, with a view to go to Ireland. He was taken ill, I said immediately, and it turns out to have been within three weeks of his leaving his wife, that he died. I did not say that this took place in Glasgow, but I said nothing contrary to it; and the use of the word "immediately," implied, that he could not be far off. His wife had him removed from the house where he was taken ill, to the house of a cousin of her own, where she could more conveniently attend to him; and in this house he died. I did not mention this circumstance before, but I said nothing inconsistent with it. I did not say that his wife nursed him in his last hours;—that he confessed and deplored his cruel conduct towards

her, especially in leaving her; that almost his last words were to crave pardon of her, and to lay the blame of his cruelty upon his priest, who, he said, had advised it. I did not say this, for which I hope Mr. Simeon and his friends will forgive me. The omission was not inconsistent with my other statements, and I am sure it was not injurious to their cause. I said his wife brought his body home and had it decently interred. This also is true, though I did not say she did it with her own hands, or that she had not the assistance which the public provides for persons in her circumstances. The letter, of which I gave an exact copy, is proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, and in such circumstances as to render improbable, if not impossible, that I had any hand in putting it there. It turns out that this letter was not of his own hand-writing, for he could not write; but happily for me, I did not say that he *wrote* it; though if I had said so, it would not have been an error, according to the common understanding of men on such a subject. A man is said to do that which another does for him at his request. I suppose nobody would think he told an untruth by saying that Paul wrote an epistle to the Romans; and yet we know that the epistle was not written by Paul, but by Tertius in his name; chap. xvi. 22. The original letter was exhibited; it was identified, and proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, when his wife went to get his clothes in the "Catholic lodging house." I used an expression which, in ordinary conversation, would be considered synonymous,—found on his person. In the present case, there is a considerable circumstantial difference, because the person and the pocket were in different places. This, however, does not in the least affect the truth of the story. Nay, it rather goes to confirm it; for had it been a fabrication, the author of it could easily have managed to have had the person and the clothes in the same place.

In short, the sum and substance of my statement was, that the man left his wife, because she would not renounce her religion, and embrace his; and that in a letter addressed to her, he avowed this to be the cause, and the only cause of his leaving her. This fact is clearly proved by the preceding declarations, which, I think, would be esteemed sufficient to establish a thing of far more importance.

The witnesses are ready to depone to their declarations whenever called upon; but really I do not think the matter is worthy of the solemnity of an oath. It regards neither life, limb, nor property. I have put myself and some friends to the trouble of witnessing, and taking down the preceding evidence, in consequence of the idle and incessant clamour of a poor creature in London, who has undertaken to defend the cause of Popery,

and of another creature here, who puts himself forward at his instigation; both of whom seem to be "gnawing their tongues with pain," because they find their system of superstition and idolatry, exposed to just abhorrence and contempt; and have not the power of defending, or of withdrawing the public mind from the contemplation of its deformity, but by raising an outcry and endeavouring to fix public attention upon a private anecdote, which is of no importance whatever in relation to the general question at issue between the Church of Rome and the Protestant.

Though I was willing to examine my witnesses upon oath, merely to satisfy those who came to demand the evidence which I had promised to furnish them with, since they would not make themselves parties to such examination, or even submit to hear the whole of it, I think the subsequent interposition of an oath would be *improper*, because *unnecessary*. My Papists may satisfy themselves in any way they please, since they refused the evidence which I offered to give them; and it was not twenty-four hours till I learned that they did attempt to satisfy themselves with the most false and unfounded accounts of the interview which was had with me. They had obtained, they said, a complete triumph. THE PROTESTANT could not maintain his ground. They had frightened him almost out of his wits, &c. I would easily disprove all this, and have disproved it partly already, but it is needless to exhibit truth to persons who are trained to lying, and to the belief of lies. I am ashamed of such language, it is so like their own; but it is sometimes proper to answer a fool according to his folly. My little experience in dealing with Papists has confirmed what a friend, who knows them well, said to me at an early period of this controversy. "You will make nothing of them; for though you should convict them of a hundred lies in a day, they would, with the most hardened effrontery, assert them all over again."

Agreeably to their request, a meeting was held with the same gentlemen in the evening, when they again insisted upon putting questions to me; and their legal adviser presented the following in writing, with a formal demand of an answer, which he was ready to take down. "Mr. M'Hardy represented that he and the other gentlemen who accompanied him, waited upon Mr. M'Gavin, in terms of an appointment, for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to him*, in relation to the letter and statement therewith connected, published in the 25th Number of THE PROTESTANT, and to be furnished with *sufficient* evidence of the truth of the averments therein published. Mr. M'Hardy stated his readiness to put the interrogatories which he held in his hand, and now called upon Mr. M'Gavin to answer."

This paper, though presented by a Protestant, was evidently the fruit of Popish cunning. I believe no Jesuit; perhaps not

even the father of Popery himself could have contrived a more artful snare to entrap the poor PROTESTANT. If they had got me, by surprise, or by any other means, to admit that the meeting was appointed for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me*, they would have had good cause of triumph in my refusing to answer their questions. They would then have maintained, and published to all the world, through their organ, Mr. Andrews, that I had refused them the evidence which I had promised to give; though it would have rested with them to say what evidence my word could be in my own cause. But it is not true that the meeting was appointed for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. No such purpose was ever avowed by me, or avowed to me, till after we had met. The words of Mr. Simeon's letter to me are,—“ Sir, I take the liberty of informing you, that in pursuance of the requisition contained in the 24th No. of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, a Protestant Gentleman, another Catholic, and myself, will wait upon you this day between the hours of 3 and 4, P. M. Should this hour prove inconvenient to you, be pleased give me early information what other would suit you better. I am, Sir, Yours, &c. St. A. Simeon.” Having to go out of town that day, I fixed the same hour of the day following. But I quote this letter to show that the proposed meeting was not for the purpose of putting questions to me. If Mr. Simeon intended this, he did not avow it: it was, he says, “ in pursuance of the requisition contained in the 24th No. of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.” Now the words of this requisition are, “ I most earnestly request that some of them (my readers) will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that *satisfactory evidence, which he has pledged himself to furnish them with.*” No. 24, col. 375. I do not believe that it ever occurred to Mr. Andrews himself, that this satisfactory evidence was to be nothing but my own word, or my answers to certain questions; but this it seems, was all that my Popish gentlemen wanted. For the word *sufficient*, in my offer of evidence, Mr. Andrews substitutes *satisfactory*, well knowing that no evidence, however sufficient, will satisfy those who are determined not to be satisfied.

Though they would not allow themselves to be entered upon the sederunt as present at the examination of my witnesses, or as at all parties concerned in it, they did, with singular inconsistency, demand an extract, or copy of the declarations, and were instantly promised it. I had nothing to conceal; I had no trick prepared to ensnare them. I did not require that they should constitute themselves parties concerned in the examination, before they had a right to demand an extract of it; but I believe that, virtually, by their demand, and my compliance with it, they have made themselves parties; and their not complying with my request to cross-

examine my witnesses, proves that they had no hope of setting aside the force of their evidence.

They waited upon me, they said, in terms of an appointment, for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. Now, they might as well have said that they came to hear me say that a piece of bread is the Saviour of the world. Had they handed me this in writing, and all joined in asserting, that I had professed my belief in transubstantiation, at 4 o'clock that day, it would have been as true as the assertion which they persisted in making with regard to the avowed purpose of our meeting.

Papists deal much in double meanings, and mental reservations. They have a sort of double oath, half of which they express outwardly by the voice; the other half they express inwardly to themselves; and the latter is usually considered the best half, or that which is most binding. Now, I doubt not, my Papists have a private meaning of their own attached to the words, "avowed purpose," which will render the expression literally true; that is, it was avowed to one another, and perhaps also to their lawyer. But when they connect the expression with that of "in terms of an appointment," and give out that this appointment was made by me, or with me, the words express a downright falsehood. I use no ceremony with the agents and correspondents of Mr. Andrews, who has many times applied the last word of the last sentence to me. I know it is wrong to render railing for railing; but I know also, it is right to call things by their own names.

I declared that I would have nothing to do with any paper that contained such an assertion; but I dictated the following to Mr. M'Hardy, which he took down. "Mr. M'Gavin stated, that if any person, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." (This was all I had promised to do.) "And I have now done so in the declarations of Margaret King, Mary Macmillan, and Elizabeth King, all therein designed, now exhibited, which declarations were begun in presence of Mr. Simeon, &c.; but these Gentlemen declined cross-questioning them, and left the room before the first was finished; of which declarations a copy will be furnished by my man of business. I do not admit the relevancy of any questions asked of me, and will answer none, but simply that question, 'Where is your evidence of the truth of your statement in THE PROTESTANT regarding the story of the man in the Wynd?' To which the above, with the documents referred to, is my answer and I do not consider that the present conference was understood to be for the purpose of putting any other question to me; and that it was not the purpose avowed in the requisition,

but merely for taking the evidence which I had to produce. —(Signed) W. M'G." In the copy furnished me by Mr. M'Hardy, the word *for* is introduced in the last sentence, which makes the sense different from my meaning. I have omitted that word, and said what I did say, that *it* (viz. the putting of questions to me,) was *not the purpose* avowed in the requisition. He has it, not *for* the purpose, &c. which does not make sense; but whether the error be in my dictating, his writing, or his clerk copying, I cannot say.

On receiving my answer, as above, Mr. M'Hardy read the first of the following memorandums, with a short preamble as follows: "Upon Mr. M'Gavin's answer, and his refusal to answer any questions, Mr. M'Hardy for himself, and in behalf of those who accompanied him, represented, 1st, That in receiving from Mr. M'Gavin any written documents, which he might think proper to furnish, they did so without in any shape admitting the correctness of these proceedings, and particularly of the paper called Declarations: against which they have many good objections in respect of the admissibility and credibility of the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted, as well as the form and shape in which they have been taken. 2d, Mr. M'Gavin is now waited upon in consequence of the call he gave to Protestants and Catholics, doubting his statements in the Forty-second Number of *THE PROTESTANT*. The hour of meeting is his own fixing; and the public will judge of Mr. M'Gavin's candour, in refusing to answer any questions, and of the respect and credit due to what he is pleased to call the evidence of the truth of his statement."

Certainly the public will judge of my candour in refusing to put myself forward as a sufficient, and as the only evidence in my own cause. I shall suppose that I had been so simple as to be caught in the snare; that I had dismissed my witnesses, and honestly answered all the questions put to me; and Mr. Simeon had sent off my answers to Mr. Andrews, as sufficient evidence to rebut his accusation of forgery, and to prove my own innocence, we should have had some whole pages of *CAPITAL LETTERS*, and notes of admiration, exclaiming against the effrontery of the "charlatan," one of the polite names which Mr. Andrews gives me, who could suppose that *his* word would be taken in proof of his innocence, after the *VINDICATOR* had *CONVICTED*, and *PROVED HIM GUILTY* of falsehood, forgery, and I do not know how many crimes.

The paper last quoted seems to be intended for a protest against their being considered parties in the examination of my witnesses; but they would have acted more consistently by not asking, or declining to receive, an extract. They say "they have many good objections against the admissibility and credibility of

the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted." So far as appeared, they did not know any of the persons, except the widow of their late *zealous* and *worthy* brother in the faith of Rome; and I learned by some hints, and halt sentences, that their objection to her was, that she was not really M'Murray's wife. "What would you think," said Mr. Simeon, in the first conversation, "of a woman who should live so many years in adultery with a man who had a wife and a family in Ireland? What credit would you give to her testimony?" "I would," said I, "consider her innocent, if she was ignorant of the fact; but I would regard the husband as a very wicked man indeed, and not worthy to be a member of any church."

I learned by this, that our Papists were going to rest the defence of their church, at least of their late brother, and perhaps of their priest, on the alleged illegality of the marriage of the parties, and of course, in their opinion, its invalidity: but it is by no means the business of THE PROTESTANT to enter into a controversy on this point, though every body knows that, in Scotland, such a marriage is as valid as if Mr. Scott had made a sacrament of it. It is enough that I have proved by two witnesses, besides the widow's own declaration, that she and the deceased were known and acknowledged for many years in Glasgow as man and wife; that, during the years of his absence, she lived as his wife, and that when he returned, she received him as her husband. She declares that she never knew of his having another wife. If he had one, which she does not believe, it proves nothing but his own wretched depravity; and my Papists must not only prove that he had a wife living when he married Margaret King, but that she knew the fact, before they can invalidate her testimony on the plea of adultery. And though they could prove this fact, which I am persuaded they cannot, I would as soon receive her testimony as that of a man who came to assert in my face what I knew to be a falsehood,—who could say, and persist in saying, that he came for a certain *avowed purpose*, when I knew that no such purpose had been avowed. If Papists attempt to invalidate the testimony of a witness on the vague suspicion of a crime, they may find the testimony of some others invalidated on the conviction of a crime; for I hold that a violation of the ninth commandment will go at least as far to set aside the credibility of a man's testimony, as a violation of the seventh commandment; nay, without regarding the latter crime as a light matter, I am persuaded there are many guilty of it, who would scorn to tell a deliberate lie, and whose testimony would go farther than that of another man who had once been convicted of an untruth.

But with regard to the case in hand, I have ample testimony on behalf of my witness, that she is a person of Christian char-

acter, whose word may be believed; and if any one attempt to injure her, either in her person or good name, she will receive the protection which the poorest individual enjoys by the laws of this country, which happily are not administered by Papists.

It will be a work truly worthy of Mr. Simeon and his friends, to persecute an industrious woman; to exaggerate, and even to invent, stories to her prejudice. I doubt not, while I am writing this, they are engaged in what Papists will consider the honourable work; and Mr. Andrews will give the story all the effect which capitals and notes of admiration can give it. There are, however, some stubborn facts proved by my witnesses, which neither our Glasgow Papists, nor their organ, *THE VINDICATOR*, will be able to set aside by all their quibbling.

It was some days after my conference with Mr. Simeon and his friends, before I could imagine what could be their design in coming to pose me with a series of questions; but when I recollected that the Inquisition had lately been revived, it occurred to me that they wished to make an experiment to ascertain whether the establishment of the holy office might not be attempted in Glasgow. In that tribunal, as every one knows, the accused person is usually made the principal witness against himself; and by flattery and cunning, they can bring the most innocent man in the world to say something which they can distort into the confession of a crime. This seemed to be the object of my Inquisitors. They tried flattery first: They had the utmost confidence, they said, in Mr. McGavin, as a gentleman, and would believe what he would say, though the very point in question was my own veracity. Afterwards, by cunning, they wished me to acknowledge, that I had concurred in the appointment of a meeting for the *avowed purpose* of being put to the inquisition, that is, to answer questions relating to charges against myself. Had I been seduced by their flattery, or ensnared by their cunning, to submit to their interrogatories, from want of experience in dealing with serpents, I might have been bitten; I might have said something which, however honestly meant, would have been turned to my disadvantage.

I never considered the story of the man in the wynd as worth a farthing in support of my general argument. I gave it merely as a recent anecdote to illustrate the Popish character. I believed it to be true from the credibility of the persons through whom it came to me, for I did not go to seek for it; and it is now proved to be true by credible witnesses. But from the clamour which Mr. Andrews and his friends have made about it, they seem to consider it the most important point in the whole controversy; and they have used every species of abuse in order to bring me to a discussion of it, with a view to divert me from exposing the idolatry and wickedness of their religion. They

have at last succeeded so far as to get me to devote a number of pages to the subject; but they will find they have gained nothing by it, as I shall return, in the commencement of my second volume, to lay open more and more of Rome's abominations.

I request my readers to remember that the controversy is between Popery and real Christianity; not between the personal characters of Mr. Andrews and myself. Mr. Andrews has laboured through many a tiresome page to bring it to a mere personal matter; and no doubt those who read only his papers will consider it such, because he has carefully avoided entering upon the more vital parts of the question. Now the personal character of parties is a matter of no consideration in a controversy about historical facts, and publicly avowed principles. If I professed to have come from Spain or Ireland, and to describe what I saw and heard of the wickedness of Popery, then, no doubt, the credibility of my testimony, so far as not corroborated by other evidence, would rest upon my personal character. But this is not the nature of my work. I speak not of what I have seen and heard, but of what I read; and I usually refer to the volume and page of my authorities, that every reader may judge for himself. Supposing I were as bad a man as Mr. Andrews represents me to be, it would not be the less true that he teaches his readers to worship the Virgin Mary, and St. Wenefride; and that he and his correspondents consider his "Catholic School book" as so much better than the Bible, that it will impart more knowledge of religion by one reading, than the Bible will do in the course of a whole life. If I gave this upon my own sole authority, and declared that I heard Mr. Andrews say so, perhaps some people would not believe me; but when I give the very words which he has printed, and the pages in which they stand, every man may prove the truth of the matter for himself. When he charges me with falsehood and forgery in numerous instances, he does it for the avowed purpose of telling his readers that what I write is not to be believed. Now though I were guilty of these things, it would not in the least affect the truth of what I have quoted from saints, and fathers, and Dr. Milner, and Mr. Andrews, and a host of Popish writers equally respectable.

I could easily rebut all his charges of falsehood, as I have done that of forgery; but I must defer this till I have gone through the remaining parts of the system, which will take a long time. But I give the following, in the meantime, as a specimen, to show how easily his charges are repelled. In his 19th Number, column 300, he says, "I now charge him (THE PROTESTANT) with asserting in his last Number a PALPABLE FALSEHOOD, in accusing me of swearing in column 108, 7th

Number of *THE VINDICATOR*. I challenge him to produce *one* word, or all of them together in that column, of my writing, which either he or his admirers, can twist or turn into *an oath*, and I refer my own readers to that Number, to satisfy them of the turpitude of this evangelical writer." In relation to this, the hand-bill on the corners of the streets contained these words, "THE PROTESTANT charged with FALSEHOOD in his 38th Number." Now let the reader judge of the truth of this accusation, and of the *VINDICATOR*'s impudence in making it. I referred to the following sentence, which begins with an oath, and shows that the poor man must have been writing in a passion;—"FAITH, I do not wonder this writer looks so far as to perceive something more than human agency on her side;" &c. All that I have to do with this at present is with the first word; and if there be any of my readers who do not think that it stands as an oath, and a great one too, I refer them to the words of Jesus Christ, Mat. v. 33—37. and xxiii. 16—22. "He that sweareth by the temple sweareth by it, and him that dwelleth therein," &c. The meaning of our Lord's words evidently is, that he that swears by any thing, swears by all that is implied in it. FAITH, therefore, is the greatest oath by which a man can swear, unless he be an atheist. It is to swear by all that he believes; and it is a greater oath in the mouth of Mr. Andrews than in that of a Protestant; for besides believing in one God, which he at least professes, he believes in the Virgin Mary, and St. Wenefride.

The reader will see that I attach very little importance to the accusations of this writer, seeing I have delayed for weeks and months the easy task of repelling them. I know his object is merely to divert me, as seamen are said to throw out a tub to the whale. This artifice indicates a conviction in his own mind that his cause cannot be maintained by fair argument. I can repeat with confidence, what I wrote some months ago, that he has not invalidated a single fact in any of my statements; has not pointed out one real contradiction, or detected a single sentence which I would wish to alter if it were to be written again. He vaunts incessantly of the great things which he has done, and of the pain which he supposes he has made me feel. I need not tell him that his boasting is vain; but I can assure my readers that his "lashes," as he calls them, have had no more effect upon me than those of Sancho Panzo had upon him, when he applied his whip to the trees instead of his own back. The fact is, Mr. Andrews overdoes his part. He throws out his abuse in such quantities, and so thick, that none of it will stick. It is known in a very extensive circle that I am not the monster of wickedness which he represents me to be; and people knowing that his abuse is unmerited, are the less disposed to attend to any thing that he writes.

Before I have done I must have a word or two with Mr. Simeon, who is better known to my readers under the name of **PAX**. It was never my intention to descend to personalities : and those who have forced me to speak of them personally have themselves to blame. Mr. Simeon knows what hand he had in originating this controversy ; and had he and his brother **AMICUS VERITATIS** received with becoming humility, a gentle rebuke for representing a Protestant assembly as worshipping their chapel, the world would not have been favoured with such a work as the present ; and Papists would have been spared the agony which they have suffered from the lucubrations of **THE PROTESTANT**. I would not, even now, have mentioned Mr. Simeon by name, if he had not thrust himself forward, as if with a view to make himself a conspicuous agent of Rome, and of Mr. Andrews. Had he come to me as an honest man, to receive the evidence which I had promised to give, and which he professed to seek ; to weigh that evidence, and give a candid opinion upon it, I would have thanked him for his pains. But he came to inveigle me with ensnaring questions, not to ascertain the truth, but to endeavour, by artifice, to convict me of falsehood. I know nothing of that French politeness, which says, " My dear friend," to my known enemy. Mr. Simeon must not therefore be surprised by my rudeness, when, at any time, I shall speak of him as I think of him.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.



